THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Vol. III.—JULY, 1878.—No. 11.

THE PROTESTANT THEORY OF CHURCH GENESIS.

PROTESTANTISM is assailable at very many points, but we question if it anywhere reveals its weakness more clearly than in its theory of church genesis, put forward by Luther, and adhered to substantially by nearly all Protestant sects. To refute its other errors, no slight knowledge of theology is often necessary; here, its gratuitous assumptions, its contradictions, and its opposition to the plain facts of Scripture and to common sense, can be made apparent to persons of ordinary intelligence. And the truth or falsehood of this theory, it should be borne in mind, is a matter of vital importance to the Reformed Churches, for, if it be false, the system of things built upon it cannot be true.

The theory is thus briefly stated by Moehler, in his *Symbolism* (chap. v.):

"In a man belief in Christ takes seed; if this faith come to maturity, then is the disciple of Christ formed. But, as a mere believer, he stands only in one relation to God, in Christ; he is a member of the invisible church of the concealed and the everywhere scattered worshippers of the Lord. But, as soon as he gives utterance to his faith, that which was hidden within him, bursts visibly forth, and he appears an open disciple of the Saviour, perceptible to the eyes of the whole world. If he find, now, several with the like views, if they associate with him, and together outwardly set forth the substance of that which they internally recognize as religious truth, then the invisible community becomes visible. The common faith, which inwardly animated and united all ere they knew each other's sentiments, becomes, as a common doctrine, an outward bond holding them all together. In the same way it is with the sacraments, and the outward worship which they acknowledge to be ordained by Christ."

From the society thus formed, the ministry is evolved in the following manner:

"No one should doubt, he says, that he is justified, nay, he is obliged to believe that he is, since all believers have received from Christ a priestly dignity, which not only entitles but binds them to exercise the office of teaching, to forgive sins, and to administer all the sacraments. *The Holy Spirit with its interior unction, instructs each one in all things*, engenders faith in him, and makes him assured of its possession. Although, now, all be qualified for, and possess the right of exercising the priestly functions, yet, *in order to avoid disorder*, they must delegate to one or more of their body the general right, to be exercised in their place and in their name, after the more respected members of the community have imposed hands on him, and, thereby, made him their bishop."

According to Luther, then, the church in its integrity is both visible and invisible, and it becomes visible, that is complete, in the manner described. He was forced to adopt some such theory as this by the necessity of his position. He had broken with the historic church of the past. That church, according to him, had failed in its mission, and fallen into the most deplorable errors, even from the time of the Apostles. The Pope was anti-christ, the bishops were his apostles. In his letters to the Bohemian Brethren, Luther describes Catholic ordination as a mere daubing, shaving, and jugglery, whereby nought but lying and idle fools, true priests of Satan, were made. There then remained nothing for him to do but to construct a new church, and to find a vocation for another ministry. This he did in the way above mentioned. Subsequently, it is true, he said and did many things that were in contradiction with his theory of church genesis, but that was the only genesis he ever attempted to give of the Church of the Reformation. The first ordination in accordance with this theory took place in Wittemberg, in May, 1525.[1]

Luther at first intended to give to the congregations formed under his teaching a purely democratic form of government. They were to be independent of one another, and the ministers were to be chosen and removed from office by a majority of the votes of the members. But this arrangement proving distasteful to the secular princes, he did not insist on it, and as the number of those princes who embraced his errors daily increased, he gradually accustomed himself to the idea of their becoming the depositaries of the powers previously held by the bishops, and eventually he put both the churches and their pastors under their guardianship and government. He established a junta of theologians at Wittemberg, through which he dictated to his followers everywhere what they were to believe, and how and by whom they were to be governed, and when any congregation attempted to exercise the right of appointing or deposing a pastor, he stigmatized their action as sacrilegious and a usurpation of a power that belonged only to the Holy Ghost.[2]

---

[1] LUTHER, *eine Skizze*, von I. Döllinger, Freiburg, 1851.

[2] Döllinger, as already cited.

Such, practically, was his regard for that "Christian liberty," so often and so eloquently extolled by him, and to which he was to have conducted all who accepted the new doctrines. Thus, at a very early period, began to be manifested those amazing contradictions between theoretical and practical Protestantism, which Protestant writers have never been able to reconcile, but which, nevertheless, they accept with a faith that is more than childlike. This theory of Luther has, we believe, been adhered to substantially by nearly all Protestant sects since his time. Practically, however, these sects will be found to have come into existence in precisely the same manner as other merely human and secular organizations. Thus viewed, there is nothing extraordinary or even unusual in the history of their formation, much less anything that would give them the shadow of a claim to divine origin. The principle of cohesion in each is a common idea, which, taken up by an individual at first, was by him communicated to others, and thus became initiative of a new creed and of a distinct and independent organization. The justification of every new departure is usually found in a theological conclusion, or in an interpretation of a text of Scripture, or in a fancied revelation, or in all these combined, at variance with some received tenet or tenets of the parent sect. The advocates of the innovation remain unknown, invisible, till they outwardly express their approval of it, and then become incorporated in the new sect. The Church of England, however, was established by law; first, by the law of lust, and then by the law of the land, after which, theologians and canonists were called in to elaborate its constitution, and give it a creed.

After Luther, among the first to try their hands at church-building, were the Anabaptists. They were rude architects, it is true, but their leaders were endowed with natural talents and a contagious enthusiasm, that made them formidable opponents of the Wittemberg Doctor. They had learned his doctrine of justification by faith, and from it deduced the inutility of infant baptism, because, as they said, infants cannot have faith. They proclaimed a millennium that was to follow the advent of Christ, and for which men were bound to prepare, by abolishing the actual order of things in Church and State, and substituting for it a commune of the most advanced type. They were, in fact, the *Intrasigentes* of the Reformation. "Let there be no pulpit," said Storck, "whence to announce the word of God, no priests, no preachers, no exterior worship, and God will descend upon you." "Brethren," said Münzer, "we are all the children of Adam. God is our father. But see what the great have done! Those wretches have dared to remodel the work of God by creating titles, privileges, and distinctions. They have reserved for themselves the comforts and

sweets of life, and have left us in labors and fatigues; they have kept riches and given us poverty. Does not the earth belong to all? Is it not our common inheritance? Why, then, take it from us? When did we renounce the inheritance of our father? . . . . In the primitive church the Apostles divided with their brethren in Jesus Christ the money which was laid at their feet. Give us back the goods you unjustly retain. Unhappy flock of Jesus Christ, how long will you groan in oppression under the yoke of the priest and the magistrate!" Thus spake the first born of the Reformation. Surely it required no descent of the Holy Spirit to build a church on principles such as these in the sixteenth century, any more than it did to organize the Commune of our own day.

Then there were the Sacramentarians, who denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, which Luther defended. This negation was the principle of cohesion in the society that formed for a time around Karlstadt, Melancthon, Œcolampadius, and Zuingli.

Calvin's specialties were the denial of free will and an assertion of predestination in the most Protestant sense. His theory of church genesis and church government differed from that of Luther, but, practically, his church came into being in precisely the same manner as those of his predecessors. What part the Holy Ghost could have had in its formation will appear further on. The human elements in its construction were, Calvin's own talents, which were of a high order, his indomitable will, the prejudice and credulity of the masses, a confession of faith to which each member was obliged to swear under penalty of chastisement in this life and the next, penal laws, exile, prisons, the rack, and the fagot. The church he thus established was as much his church as any other society can be said to be that of the man who framed its constitution, drew its members together, gave it laws, and governed it. Before his time it had not existed as a society, and, therefore, not as a church, and but for him would never have had a place *in rerum natura*. And the same must be said of all the sects and schisms that have arisen since the time of the Apostles.

Now, the Church, we need hardly say, is not a mere human organization. It is indeed composed of men, but, in its origin, its end, and the chief means it makes use of to accomplish its mission, it is, and must be divine. It was instituted to give to fallen man a knowledge he had lost, and which he could not of himself recover, of his origin and his destiny, and to afford him the helps, far above his natural strength, necessary to fulfil that destiny. That knowledge, those helps, God alone can give, and hence the church must, of necessity, be his work. Men are able to establish any other kind

of society. They can form literary, scientific, philanthropic, political associations, they can establish civil governments, but God alone can found a church. And this being the case, what possible claim can any one or all of the Reformed sects have to a divine origin? Were their founders inspired of God to establish them? Some of them, indeed, claimed to have received such a mission, but were never able to prove their pretension. Was it Erasmus, or who was it that said of the Reformers of his day, that they had never been able to cure a blind horse, in testimony of the truth of their teachings? Luther declared repeatedly "that he had received his doctrines from heaven by divine inspiration, that his word was not his word but Christ's, that his mouth was Christ's mouth, that Christ himself had called him to be an evangelist, that his doctrine made him the judge not only of men but of angels, and that all who did not receive it would infallibly be damned."[1] But the perverse generation that asked for a sign in proof of his apostolate had to ask in vain. Yet Luther himself had the face to challenge the Anabaptists to this very same kind of proof of the divinity of their doctrines. In his account of an interview he had with Stübner and Cellarius, he says: "These turbulent and proud spirits cannot bear gentle admonitions, they wish to be believed on their own authority and from the first word; they will endure neither discussion nor inquiry! When I saw them obstinate, tergiversating, and endeavoring to escape from me in their confusion of words, I soon discovered the old serpent. I ceased not to say to them, prove to me, at least, your doctrine by miracles, for it is not in the Scriptures. They shuffled and refused me the signs. I threatened to force them to believe me. Master Martin Cellarius chafed and raged like one possessed, speaking without being asked, and not allowing me to put in a word. I sent them to their God, since they refused miracles to mine."[2] But when his opponents asked the great Reformer what miracles he himself had wrought to prove that he had been sent of God, he flew into a rage and dismissed the assembly.

Or, does the fact that the sects believe in the revealed truths contained in the Sacred Scriptures entitle them to be considered divine institutions? By no means. The Bible is not the Church. The Bible came from the Church, not the Church from the Bible. A society must exist before it acts, and the Bible is but an expression, and a partial and incidental expression at that, of the belief of the Church. The Church was complete, and in the exercise of all its functions before a line of the Bible was written. This

---

[1] Döllinger, already cited.

[2] Audin, vol. ii., page 13, London, 1854.

is true of the Jewish and, as far as the New Testament is concerned, of the Christian church. Besides, is it not possible for men individually to leave the church or be expelled from the fold, and still retain or think they retain a belief in the Scriptures? The Jews believe in the Old Testament, yet they have ceased to be the people of God. Why, then, may not men establish a society on "Bible principles" without any authority whatever from on high for so doing?

But, may not the Reformed Churches be able to establish a connection with the pure and orthodox church of apostolic times by means of an invisible church, and thus furnish a proof that they are of God? This they cannot do. The Church, indeed, has an invisible side, so to speak, but she is essentially both visible and invisible. A purely invisible church would be less a church than a disembodied spirit could be said to be a man, or any number of such spirits a society. The Church of Christ is necessarily a visible society. It was established for men, and was to be governed by men, and, as St. Augustine says (*Contra Faustum*, xix. 2): "*In nullum nomen religionis, verum, seu falsum, coagulari homines possunt nisi aliquo signaculorum, vel sacramentorum consortio colligentur.*" It was visible from the first day of its existence, had visible pastors, visible flocks, visible sacraments, was seen and known of men, was obeyed and loved by some, hated and persecuted by others. It was to teach all nations, and all were to hear it as if Christ himself had spoken. "He that hears you, hears me." But how could nations or individuals hear or obey an invisible church? It was to this visible Church the Redeemer said before he ascended to Heaven: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world," and to which he promised to send the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth, to teach it all things and abide with it for ever. Supposing, then, that as Protestants assert, the Church in the first, second, or third century, had erred in matters of faith, changed the constitution given it by the Saviour, and become invisible, that is, restricted to a few orthodox believers and just men known only to God, it would have ceased to exist as a church and even as a society, and falsified the promises made to it by its divine Founder in the most explicit and formal manner. To have attempted then, in such a hypothesis, to establish a union with the Church of the Apostles, would have been to try to establish it with what did not exist and had not existed for more than fifteen centuries, a rather difficult undertaking it must be confessed. If, then, "the Church of the Reformation" be a divine institution, it must also be an entirely new one, and as such it is obliged to prove its mission by miracles as did the early Church. Not only of his Apostles, but of his followers generally, though not universally,

Christ said: "And these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up serpents, and if they shall drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them. They shall lay their hands upon the sick and they shall recover." Still more extraordinary powers were conferred on the Apostles themselves, and exercised by them on various occasions. But where among the first Reformers or their descendants can even a trace of such "signs" be discovered? Yet in the hypothesis that the Church founded by the Apostles had failed, and Christ's promises to it been falsified, more and greater miracles would evidently have been needed to make men believe in another. This hypothesis is, of course, impossible, absurd. For had the Church founded by Christ failed, miracles would have been wrought in favor of a lie, and would thus forever more have lost their value as evidences of the truth. When Catholics challenge Protestants to produce miracles in proof of the divine origin of the sects, it is not because they think it possible for them to do so, but precisely because they know it to be utterly impossible. And this is the reason why, though Christ placed no limits as to time to miraculous manifestations in His Church, and though, in point of fact, they have taken place in every age and in every land from its foundation to the present time, Protestants coolly and without examination reject all miracles not mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures.

But there is another objection to this theory of church genesis, arising from the nature of Protestantism itself, that should not be lost sight of. It is this, that, accepting the fundamental Protestant doctrines as true, no sufficient reason can be assigned for the existence of any Church organization whatever. Their doctrines are justification by faith alone, and private judgment in matters of faith. If men are justified by faith alone without good works, and in spite of bad works, if by it they are made pleasing to God, and fully prepared for heaven, they certainly stand in no need of sacramental or other saving influences. If they are instructed in religious truth by God alone, either directly or through the medium of the Scriptures, is it necessary for them to listen to mere human teachers, who, it is admitted can and do sometimes, mislead them? And if ministerial functions be thus shown to have no place in the Protestant system, the influences looked for in congregational worship can hardly be considered indispensable to the spiritual well-being of individual Protestants. The most logical Protestants the writer ever knew were an old couple in Ebensburg, in Pennsylvania, who, for the reasons just mentioned, would never join a Church, but remained at home on Sundays and read the Bible for each other in turn. But, to be entirely consistent with their principles, these

good people should have dissolved their domestic congregation, and worshipped separately according to their individual lights.

There are thousands and tens of thousands of Protestants who are not "church members." In what proportion they may be to those who belong to particular sects we have no means of knowing; but, were we to judge by our own experience, we should say they are at least twice as numerous as the regular church members. Now, we would ask, have these Protestants unattached the right to be considered Protestants or have they not? They themselves think they have, and we do not see how the members of the sects can question their claim to be so regarded. And, if they may enjoy all the substantial benefits of "Protestant Christianity," why employ all the troublesome and expensive machinery of a ministry to save others? Fidelity to their fundamental principles, apart from its other recommendations, would be of immense advantage to our separated brethren on the score of economy. It would, so far as they are concerned, furnish an easy solution of the question now agitating the public mind in regard to the taxation of church property, and effectually remove the embarrassment felt by many Episcopalians in maintaining a married clergy on their frontier missions. "Partial celibacy," the means suggested by some to meet this last-mentioned difficulty, will not remove it. It is regarded by Protestants generally as a partial evil, and, worse still, as partial Romanism. The lonely apostolate it would impose might have been entirely practicable in the primitive Church, or even in the dark ages, but is quite above the strength of modern Protestant missionaries to the heathen. And if a very few were forced to give it a trial, the suspicion that would rest upon them would soon dry up the sources of the scanty revenue necessary for their support.

Besides, ecclesiastical communion, even of the most restricted kind, has in it a "Romanizing germ," which sooner or later will cause trouble. "The logical Emmons," whoever he may be, seemed to feel as much, when in defence of absolute independency he said: "Association leads to consociation, consociation to presbytery, presbytery to episcopacy, episcopacy to the Roman Catholic Church, and the Roman Catholic Church to the Devil." (*Churchman*, March 25th, 1878.)

Those who adopt the Anglican rule of faith as distinguished from the common Protestant rule, do not escape the inconsistencies just referred to. What that rule is, may be gathered from the following official sources of Anglican teaching. No. xx., of the "Articles of Religion," declares that: "The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith, and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one

place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another." In the Act of Supremacy, Elizabeth decrees: "That her delegate in ecclesiastical affairs shall define nothing to be heresy that is not judged to be such on the authority of Scripture, and of the first four general councils." One of the canons of convocation presided over by Parker, in 1571, ordains: "That the clergy shall take care to teach nothing from the pulpit to be religiously held and believed by the people, that is not in conformity with the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and derived from the teaching of the Catholic Fathers and early Bishops." The clause, "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," would seem to give to it in the Anglican system a *raison d'être* and an importance which it has not in other Protestant denominations. This, however, is really not the case. For, whatever the nature and extent of the authority here claimed for the church may be,—matters about which Anglican divines differ very widely in opinion,—it certainly is not of a kind to oblige individual consciences to defer to it against their own convictions. This an infallible authority alone can do, an authority formally disclaimed by the Established Church in her Articles, and which the great majority of Anglican writers admit she does not, in any sense, possess. Bishop Burnet, in his explanation of the twentieth Article, says the authority here mentioned is not founded on infallibility, but is one merely for the preservation of good order. Bishop Marsh[1] tells us that this article gives the church no more authority than every civil society has in civil controversies. "Individuals," he says, "are bound to accept its decisions if they would continue to be members of her communion, but not because they are in themselves binding on conscience." But who does not know that even this merely external authority is hardly ever asserted by the Church of England? From its very beginning to the present time, that church has been a theological Babel, the like of which has not been seen in any age or in any other land. Hardly a heresy of the East or the West but has found followers and defenders among its bishops and its inferior clergy. They hold to-day, and profess, the most conflicting views in regard to the Trinity, Justification, Original Sin, Baptism, Orders, the Eucharist, Penance, and many other fundamental doctrines of faith. They are Arians, Sabellians, Nestorians, Calvinists, Arminians, Ritualists, and Latitudinarians, without, however, ceasing to be ministers of the Church of England. This church, "which hath authority in controversies of faith," permits them to indulge these "divergencies of opinion" to their hearts' content. How can it do otherwise? They, the clergy, are the teaching

[1] Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome, chap. 8.

church, the church that "hath authority;" but, holding hardly any doctrine in common, how can they be expected to unite in condemning a particular error? And even could they by any chance unite in such a condemnation, their act would have no weight where the convictions of those it affected remained unchanged. It would bring with it no external authority to which these convictions, in a particular case, could or should yield. Anglicans are taught to believe that: "As the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred . . . in matters of faith;" and that: "General councils . . . may err, and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining to God." (Art. xix. and xxi.) What assurance, then, can they have that their own church may not do the same? They are thus theoretically no better off than other Protestants, whilst, practically, they are much worse off. For, whilst their rule of faith enlarges the field of their theological investigation, by adding to the dead letter of Scripture the equally dead and no less obscure letter of tradition, it gives them a guide no more reliable and far less accessible than is to be found in the other sects. What, then, in the name of common sense is the use of a church that defines no truth and condemns no error, and that has not done so for three centuries, though in that time every known heresy has been publicly professed and advocated by men belonging to its communion, and even by its ministers? We venture to predict that even the Pan-Anglican Synod, now assembling at Lambeth, will not depart from this policy of silence, or that if it do, "there will be wigs on the green."

The work of church-building, we need hardly tell the reader, is carried on as diligently in this as in other lands. We Catholics hold to the antiquated belief that the church was established to teach and save the world. Protestants seem to think differently. They write and speak about her, and act towards her, precisely as if they thought she had been put under the guardianship of the world, and of anybody and everybody in the world who might happen to feel an interest in her. If they are not mistaken in their estimate of her, she must be the weakest, the most incoherent, as well as the most incomprehensible of all earthly organizations. In their opinion, she is everywhere and she is nowhere, she is one and she is many; her very name is an abstraction, or, rather, a mere tradition. But, wherever they think to find her, she is always incomplete, inchoate, failing, or falling to pieces. She has hardly the stability of a provisional government, a political party, or a respectable business firm. Bankers, brokers, drygoods merchants, tailors, corner-grocery keepers, all sorts of people, are high in her councils, help to shape her doctrines, her discipline, and her liturgy,

if she have any, patronize, "run" her. Her ministers not agreeing as to the message they should deliver, and unable to speak as men "having authority," are obliged to adapt their preaching to the views of their hearers, or be driven from their pulpits. Nor do we hear of their furnishing many martyrs to conviction in this particular. Too many of them would seem to be animated by the accommodating spirit of that Western candidate for Congressional honors, who, having explained to his audience his position in regard to the "living issues," supplemented his remarks by saying: "Gentlemen, these are my views, but if you don't like them, why, they can be altered." Her people, left to their own guidance, listen to those only who reflect their own opinions in matters of doctrine, or become a prey to every ambitious or deluded reformer, who, having gained an influence over them, chooses to lead them into new paths.

Surely this is not the Church the prophet had in view when he said: "For behold darkness shall cover the earth, and a mist the people, but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and His glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall walk in thy light, and kings in the brightness of thy rising." This is not the Church of the living God, that was built upon a rock, that was to *teach* all nations, with which Christ promised to abide "all days," against which the gates of hell were not to prevail, and to which the spirit of truth was sent "to teach it all truth and abide with it forever." No, darkness, and dissent, and confusion are all that such a church has brought, or can bring into the world. Itself a conspiracy against the truth, it has been the fruitful source of disorder and rebellion amongst its own followers. Sects have sprung from it by a law of its being, and will continue to do so as long as it retains a single truth that ignorance or passion can lead men to deny or call in question.

Among the periodicals that represent the "Current Reformation," in this country at present, is the *Christian Quarterly*, an earnest and, so far as we can judge from the one number of it before us, a sincere advocate of Evangelical Protestantism. It deplores the multiplicity of sects in this country, and makes some very just reflections on the subject, which Protestants would do well to consider. It says:

"We Protestants hold and teach many errors. This is clear from our disagreements among ourselves. In every disagreement there must be at least one error. Both parties cannot be correct; but both may be wrong. It depends on what is affirmed, and what the counter-affirmation is.

"The Protestants have made many very great mistakes, both in doctrine and practice. In both they disagree. This disagreement has led to the organization of different denominations, and to rivalries, contentions, and a vast expenditure of both time and funds which should have been appropriated to the conversion of men. The

time and money have both been wasted. For this waste they are accountable to God, who will judge every man according to his works, whether good or evil. This denominationalism is not an innocent matter, as many suppose; much less is it useful, and therefore commendable, as some others teach. It is hostile to the law of unity, so frequently enjoined in the New Testament, and which is summarily expressed in these anti-denominational words: 'Let there be no divisions among you.'

"Can any one suppose that the one body of which St. Paul spoke was made up of the various denominations now existing among us? It was not, and were it possible out of such *conflicting plurality* to form a *unity*, it still would not be the 'one body' of which he spoke, and therefore it would not be the body of which Christ is the head. The plain truth is that the unity of Christ's body (the Church) is utterly incompatible with denominationalism. The truth in this case cannot be disguised, and will not be disputed."—*Christian Quarterly*, June, 1876, page 104, and following.

But what is the remedy the writer suggests for this state of things? Why, to form another sect, which, of course, is to be unsectarian, and to do so by the very simple process of "unloading." "What remains to be done," he says, "is to abandon all sectarian names, and disolve all sectarian organizations, and to organize as a Church of Christ, and assume that name."

"Some doctrinal points," another writer in the *Christian Quarterly* tells us, page 113, "have been established," by the directors of this movement, "but," he adds, "when we say established, we mean concurred in by the reformers, yet we trust with that openness of mind to conviction that will permit us to dissent, if it can be shown that they are not sustained by the teachings of the Bible." The *naïveté* of this last statement is truly refreshing. The "reformers" seem not to have been agreed as to the name by which the new organization should be known. The writer just quoted thought it ought to be, "The Church of Christ," another seemed to prefer that of "The Church of God." We had thought that a church laying claim to both these titles had been in existence for some time, but we must have been mistaken.

These gentlemen have our sympathy. No one can blame them for trying to construct a raft out of the wreck of creeds around them. A raft is not an ark, but it is better than the deep sea.

The writers in the *Christian Quarterly*, however, do not monopolize the work of reform in the United States. There is the Reformed Episcopal Church, of which all we know is, that it was organized about four years ago to check what its founders considered Romanizing tendencies in the parent sect. A Romanizing tendency, by the way, is about the only weakness Protestants cannot overlook in the "mother that begot them *in the Gospel*." She may enter into a *mesalliance* with the state, she may keep very questionable company, consort with rationalists, infidels, and red republicans, may imbibe their principles, and talk their nonsense, without forfeiting the respect and love of her children or the regard of "sister churches;" but no sooner does she develop a

tendency towards Rome, than children and sisters call her to order, and compel her to mend her ways, and, if she fail to do so, denounce and desert her. It may be remarked, however, that tendencies of this kind are never voluntary in the sects. They are but manifestations of an effort, often, no doubt, a well-meant effort, to find for Protestantism some kind of theological basis to infuse into it a little religious life, and, by so doing, to keep under its influence that more intellectual and better class of people, who, if not deceived by the shadows, might ultimately find in the Catholic Church the substance of the things they hope for. The usual result of such effort is to send a few chosen souls into the Church, and precisely because of this, to create a reaction in the sects from which they come towards extreme Protestant or Rationalistic views. This is notably true of the Oxford movement in England, and of the German Reformed movement in this country, led by Dr. Nevin, the most learned and able writer Protestantism has produced on this side of the Atlantic.

The Reformed Episcopal Church, we are told, already gives signs of disintegration, and is ready to split into three different sects.

A less important body, perhaps, though equally entitled to our respect, is "The Day Star Church," which a Boston contemporary informs us was organized by the Rev. Alexander Ellis, pastor of the Gay Street Church. Who Mr. Ellis may be, or what the particular irregularities he may have discovered in the church of his baptism, we do not know; but certain it is he has only exercised a right that belongs to every child of the Reformation.

In another paper we read that a Mr. Pickle, of Iowa, has invented a new religion, which the *Chicago Times* remarked, "possesses many elements of popularity, and will undoubtedly supply a want long felt." Though this church may not last forever, it ought to keep for awhile at least.

In fact, not a year passes that one or more new sects do not make their appearance amongst us, each laying claim to the modest mission of putting sister churches and the rest of the world to rights. We often resolved to pigeon-hole the notices of their advent, as they appeared in the newspapers, but we have failed to do so. The latest thing of the kind we have seen is the following card, which we clipped a few weeks ago from a Western daily:

CHRISTIAN WORK.

A CARD FROM M. G. McMAHAN,

Missionary and Children's Evangelist.

Afflicted persons wishing me to visit their homes, and particularly parents who desire that I should converse and pray with their children, will please address me through the post-office (Box 467), stating the locality of their residences, etc.

Inquirers, children, and others, who may desire to specially see me for religious conversation and prayer, will please to call at the rooms of the Y. M. C. A. in Williams's Block, on any Saturday afternoon, at 5 o'clock. At other times I can be found at the Cozzens House, where I have my rooms, on any afternoon from 2 to 4 o'clock, except Sunday.

A large quantity of excellent religious and temperance publications always on hand at these rooms, free to all.

The children are especially invited to call at either place for these newspapers and books.

Cut this out for future reference.

M. G. McMAHAN,
Missionary.

Everything must have a beginning. This "Evangelist's" work is not perfect. It may be said to be as yet only in the *Kindergarten* stage of development. But who can tell what it may not become, even in the lifetime of its illustrious founder? It is now a one-man-power, out-door, jobbing, peripatetic concern; but the day may come when it will have its churches, conferences, general assemblies, Bible House, Book Concern, and Board of Foreign Missions.

What a pity that no one should have thought of getting up a Church Department, in connection with the late Centennial Exhibition. In no other field of thought has the activity of the human mind been so strikingly displayed, here or elsewhere, as in this of church-making. The busts alone of the distinguished men, who, from Ebion to Mr. Pickle and Mr. McMahan have invented new creeds, and embodied them in religious organizations, would have filled a Walhalla as large as Memorial Hall, and their books would have required an Annex for themselves.

And thus the Protestant theory of Church genesis has been applied, from the time of Luther to the present day; and thus in all probability it will continue to be applied to the end of the world. It has led to the formation of hundreds of contradictory sects, and thereby effectually refuted itself, for God cannot be the author of contradiction or of anything that leads to contradiction. Had the Apostles contradicted one another in their writings, had the churches they established differed in their constitutions, their government, and their formularies of faith, what should be thought of their claim to a divine mission and to divine inspiration? Why simply this, that in asserting it they had either been themselves deceived or they had sought to deceive others. A revelation that contradicts itself must be either a delusion or a pretence. This very evident truth has led millions of Protestants to renounce Christianity, which they had known only in the fragmentary and contradictory form in which it is presented by Protestantism, and made perhaps quite as many millions of the heathen world refuse even to consider its claims to their belief. Protestantism has thus proved itself

to be the greatest enemy of revealed religion, whilst professing to reform and purify it. Infidelity, too, knowing how little it has to fear, and how much to hope from it, everywhere recognizes it as an ally in the warfare it is waging against the Christian name. The infidel governments of Italy, Spain, Mexico, and South America, to-day, can see no more effectual means of destroying Christian faith in these countries, than by letting loose upon them swarms of false preachers from the different Protestant sects. They know full well that, should these apostles of doubt and disorder succeed, the work that will remain for *them* to do will be mere child's play.

And even where Protestantism has not yet developed into open infidelity, it has weakened belief in the Christian truths it still retains, it has banished from the minds of its adherents every correct idea of Christian unity, of a church, and of church authority, and thereby prepared the way for that widespread lawlessness that now threatens the very existence of Christian society in many lands. The sects, indeed, are far from recognizing these effects of the Reformation. They have made repeated efforts, of late years, to remedy the evils it has caused in this direction; but, thus far, with the sole result of putting in a clearer light their hopeless divisions, and their consequent exclusion from that fold of which unity was to be a distinguishing feature. Unity is impossible without integrity of faith and authority, and these are to be found only in the Catholic Church.

Catholics have no *theory* of church genesis. In this as in all other matters connected with revelation they adhere to the simple record of history. Revelation is either a fact or a fiction of the most frightful kind, and it must be dealt with as one or the other.

Christ established but one Church. Now, what does history tell us of the formation or genesis of that Church? Simply this, that it was founded by Christ, by His word, by the word of His Apostles, and by the internal operation of divine grace on the hearts of men. Faith and the Church came "by hearing." Christ came first, then the Apostles whom He called by an external as well as by an internal call. "You have not chosen me," He said to them, "but I have chosen you." The Apostles gathered around them congregations of believers, and these congregations composed the Church. To these believers the Apostles could have said what their divine Master had said to them: You have not chosen us, but we have chosen you. We have instructed, baptized you, made you children of God, and members of His Church. In the Gospel we have begotten you. We do not derive our authority from you, but from Him who said to us: "Going, therefore, teach all nations." "He that hears you hears Me, he that despiseth you despiseth Me."

From among the converts thus made they selected and ordained

priests and bishops, and the ministers who were to assist them in the government of the Church. Thus, Paul and Barnabas having returned to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, ordained priests "in every church" (Acts xxiv. 22). Paul placed Timothy over the Church of Ephesus (I Tim. i. 3), and Titus over that of Crete (Tit. i. 5). He gave them rules for the government of those churches, and very precise instructions in regard to the qualifications of those they would elevate to the priesthood. He says to Timothy: "Stir up the grace of God that is in thee *by the imposition of my hands;*" "Impose not hands lightly on any man;" and to Titus: "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst *ordain priests* in every city as I also appointed thee." Here there is no mention of the laity having taken any part in the election of either priests or bishops. Bishops, indeed, were "to have a good testimony from them that were without;" that is, from unbelievers, and this testimony was then and long afterwards generally asked from believers, but nothing more. St. Irenæus, St. Clement of Alexandria, and other early writers inform us that St. John in Asia, and St. Peter in the churches of the West, everywhere appointed bishops and priests, requiring only the opinion of the faithful as to their fitness for the duties and the responsibilities they were to assume.

Protestants adduce but two instances from Scripture of what they think to be a departure from the practice here indicated. The first is from Acts i. 23, where the brethren whom Peter addressed are said, at his request, to have "appointed two, Joseph, called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And praying they said: Thou Lord who knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen to take the place of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas hath by transgression fallen, that he might go to his own place. And they gave them lots, and they fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered among the eleven Apostles."

The other is from Acts vi., where we read: "Then the twelve calling together the multitude of the disciples said . . . . Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of good reputation, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and the ministry of the word. . . . And the saying was liked by all the multitude. And they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Simon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch. These they set before the Apostles, and they praying, imposed hands upon them."

As already cited, Luther held, and Protestants generally hold,

that by baptism all Christians are made priests, and that the exercise of priestly functions by particular individuals is regularly provided for by the choice of the community, or by those who represent the community. The two cases cited above are, they contend, instances of the exercise of this right of choice by the first Christians.

In proof of the universal priesthood of Christians, they bring such texts as the following: "Be you also as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God and Jesus Christ" (1 Peter ii. 5), and from the same chapter, verse 9: "But you are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood," and Apoc. 1. 5, 6. "And from Jesus Christ . . . . . who hath made us a kingdom, and priests to God and his Father." But these texts prove nothing to their purpose. A priest, in the ordinary meaning of the term, is one appointed to perform certain external public acts of religion, such as to offer sacrifice properly so-called, to administer sacraments, to preach, and govern the people in spiritual matters. In this sense all Christians are not priests, for Christ nowhere commissioned all to discharge such functions, but only the Apostles and their successors, to whom he said, "Do this in commemoration of me," "Going, therefore, teach all nations," "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." But there is a figurative, a mystic sense in which this term may be applied, and in which it is frequently applied both in the Scriptures and in the writings of the Fathers to all Christians. There are sacrifices that are such figuratively, as, for example, prayers and other internal and external virtuous acts, and as all can offer this to God, so, to this extent, all can be and are called priests. It is in this sense the term is used in the texts above cited, and in Hebrews xiii. 15, where it is said: "By him therefore let us offer *the sacrifice of praise* to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips giving glory to His name." In the same sense all the children of Israel were priests, for the Lord said to them through Moses: "And you shall be to me a priestly kingdom, and a holy nation," Exod. xix. 6. But as this figurative and mystic priesthood, shared by all the Jews, gave them no claim to the external, visible, and real priesthood, which was limited to the family of Aaron, so, in like manner, the mystic priesthood of Christians does not confer upon them the special ministry assigned to the Apostles and their successors.

But in the cases cited from the Acts of the Apostles, did the people really elect, or claim to elect, either Matthias or the seven deacons? They did nothing of the kind. In the first case they, at the request of Peter, merely selected the two for whom the lots were to be cast: "And they gave them lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias."

The election they left to the Lord, as is evident from the words: "Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two thou hast chosen." The Apostles seem to have thought, or it may have been revealed to them, that as they themselves had been chosen directly by Christ, so also the successor of Judas should be chosen by Him.

As to the case of the seven deacons, their election and ordination were clearly the work of the Apostles. This is evident from the very words of St. Luke. Provision was to be made for a more efficient and satisfactory administration of the temporalities of the Church than had existed under the deaconesses. It was most desirable that the persons to whom it would be confided, should, as far as possible, enjoy the confidence of the people. Accordingly, "the twelve, calling together the multitude of the disciples said, . . *look ye out* among you seven men of good reputation . . . whom *we may appoint* over this business . . . . and they chose Stephen," etc. "These they *set before* the Apostles, and they praying, imposed hands upon them." Surely, there is nothing here to prove that the seven deacons received their office or their authority from the people. All the people did was "to look them out," to *set them before* the Apostles, who *appointed* and *imposed hands upon*, that is, ordained them.

All human acts, even such as are raised by divine grace above the natural order, and those that are done by Christ's ministers in His name and by His authority, must be regulated by prudence. But in nothing is the exercise of this virtue more necessary than in the choice of those who are to fill the ranks of the priesthood. The bishops of the Church are warned not to "impose hands lightly on any man." The candidates should be persons of unblemished reputation, of undoubted virtue, and of talents to fit them for the proper discharge of the exalted duties they intend to assume. Whether or not they are possessed of these qualifications can certainly be known only by the testimony of those among whom and with whom they have lived. Before the existence of colleges and seminaries, in which students for the ministry are brought under the immediate observation of their superiors and professors, the opinion of the people as to their fitness or unfitness for orders had an importance which it has not had since institutions of this kind were established. It was only to be expected then, that on some occasions at least the Apostles should have asked for that opinion before imposing hands on those who were to be promoted to the priesthood or the episcopacy, and that for centuries after their time the bishops of the Church should have taken the same precaution. The custom, however, was never universal, which it would have been had it been considered of divine

right. In some places it did not exist, and even where it did, when the bishops were satisfied as to the dispositions of the candidates, they often ordained them without any reference whatever to the people.

But did the approval or presentation of candidates by the people at any time amount to an election, or their disapproval to a veto of an election or ordination? By no means. Their opinion was asked merely as a precautionary step in the exercise of a right that belonged exclusively to the bishops. The people recommended, proposed, presented; the bishops elected and ordained. The action of the people was merely incidental and preparatory to the action of the bishops, but in no wise necessary to its validity. A merchant who needs a confidential clerk, may request some of his friends to "look out" and propose the names of a few individuals whom they may think suitable for the position. When, from the persons thus recommended he appoints one, can his act be said to be that of the friends he had consulted? Can they in any sense be said to make the appointments? The President of the United States, or a member of Congress, may do the same before filling a vacancy at West Point, or he may make the cadetship a prize for a competitive examination. In either case, is it not his action, and his action alone, that gives validity and effect to the appointment? In many places laymen had, and still have, the right of presentation to ecclesiastical benefices; does it follow from this that they have the power of investiture in such benefices? Why, then, should the people be said to have the right to elect the clergy simply because in past times, and in certain places, the Apostles and the bishops who succeeded them, for prudential reasons, solicited their opinion as to the fitness or unfitness of those who were about to receive orders?

All Christians, then, are not made priests by baptism, except in the figurative sense already explained. To become members of the real, external, visible priesthood, they must receive another sacrament, the Sacrament of Orders from the hands of a bishop. From what has been said, it is no less clear that neither in the time of the Apostles, nor since, did priests or bishops receive their office or their mission from the laity, but from those whom the Holy Ghost had placed "to rule the Church of God." The Protestant theory of church genesis has thus been shown to rest on two assumptions equally false; and is therefore itself false, and without foundation in dogma or tradition. It was invented for an occasion, and can be accepted only by those in whose minds prejudice has supplanted reason and the revealed word of God.

LA SALLE AND THE JESUITS.

The Discovery of the Great West. By Francis Parkman. Seventh Edition. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

DURING the decennial period that preceded the year 1666, one of the Jesuit colleges in Western France, harbored, for some time, it is said, a young professor—a scholastic of the society—whose adventurous career on our own side of the Atlantic has become, since about the middle of the present century, the subject of considerable research and more declamation. In that Jesuit's soul, aspirations, it appears, were striving for the mastery, whose unchecked growth could lead to no other result than to make the magisterial office intolerably irksome to him, and the yoke of obedience all but unendurable. The four walls of a classroom were too narrow for that scheming mind. Watch the tall and manly-looking youth while he listens in the refectory to the recital of those reports sent yearly by the Fathers of the society in New France, describing among other things their travels to the fresh-water seas of the far West, and already pointing out the avenues to still more distant regions, perhaps to the very shores of Japan and China. If his stern and impenetrable features betray no emotion, his fixed attention and the kindling lustre of his eye bespeak a world of secret longings. There are others beside him, Fathers as well as scholastics, whose souls are stirred to their depths. Not a few of them envy the lot of their brethren in the Canadian wilds, and would fain join them in their life of self-devotion and suffering, running with them to the rescue of souls. Is he, too, burning with a desire to consume the energies of an aspiring mind in the humble service of his Master? If ever that flame warmed his soul, it did not last long enough to perfect the holocaust. The fuel was wanting: a heart as large and as compassionate, as his mind was active and his will resolute and stubborn.

Mens sana in corpore sano is among the chief requisites the Society of Jesus makes on the part of aspirants for its vows. Within the ranks of an army mustered for actual warfare, such as the soldiers of St. Ignatius are engaged in, diseased bodies, and still more, eccentric, ill-balanced, intractable minds, would prove only an incumbrance. Hence the circumspection in the admittance, and the wise rules for the probation of candidates. But even the wise and the wary may be deceived. Besides, man is liable to deterioration, bodily, mentally, and morally. Germs of disease may long lie dormant, and sprout after years of secret growth. If a

misfortune of this kind befall one of the professed members of the society, what can be the result? The vows once taken, failing health of body or mind will render the sufferer but a subject of more loving care on the part of his brethren. If the disease be moral, the difficulty is greater, and a crisis may ensue. In the case of hopeless moral malconformation and utter incompatibility of temper, amputation will have to be resorted to. In most instances of this kind, however, the patient will feel ill enough at ease to make himself the overture. The dispensation, short of which he cannot with a safe conscience sever the bonds, will be granted—with sad forebodings, it is true, on the part of the superiors, but it will be granted. Let him go forth into the world! There perchance the inexorable discipline of adversity, the powerful caustic of humiliation, and such other remedies as Providence only knows how to administer, may at length bring about a cure. The "tribulation of the flesh," the failure of every fond hope, one crushing blow after another, will perhaps one day shatter the fabric of illusions which so long kept hidden from that clouded mind the things that were for its peace.

Through a process of that sort—the severing of sacred bonds—our young professor had gone, it appears, early in or before the year above mentioned. There is no record of the transaction. But in the spring of 1666, Robert Cavelier de La Salle—for he is the subject of the preceding remarks—embarked for America, no more a Jesuit. How it fared with him in the New World, history tells; but history is liable to diverse interpretations. Hence, facts known to all may be sometimes usefully retold. For the purpose of the present discussion it will, however, suffice to rehearse a few scenes of the drama of which La Salle is the gloomy hero.

Eight years had gone by. On Easter Sunday, 1674, one of the Sulpitians in Montreal, the half brother of the great Fénelon, preached at solemn high mass in one of the churches of that infant city, all the chief persons of the settlement being present. The officiating parish priest and three assistant clergymen occupied seats in the sanctuary. Yielding to one of those strong impulses that sometimes throw even prudent men off their guard, the fiery Abbé administered in certain passages of his discourse wholesome advice to one who at that hour very likely sat listening to another sermon, far off in Quebec, and, unfortunately, was no less a personage than Louis de Buade, Count de Frontenac, Governor-General of the Colony of New France. It should be remarked that in those days great excitement prevailed in Montreal, in consequence of Frontenac's unreasonable and illegal proceedings against the governor of that settlement. The Abbé Fénelon himself, while attempting to bring about a reconciliation, had been

roughly treated by the overbearing Count. Hence the political sallies in that sermon. The priests in the sanctuary undoubtedly felt ill at ease; but the offence seemed not serious enough to call for present interference—for rebuke or disavowal in the holy place. Such, however, was not the opinion of a distinguished layman who had taken his seat near the door of the crowded little church. "As the preacher proceeded, he suddenly rose to his feet in such a manner as to attract the notice of the congregation. As they turned their heads, he signed to the principal persons among them, and by angry looks and gesticulations called their attention to the words of Fénelon. Then meeting the eye of the curé who sat beside the altar, he made the same signs to him, to which the curé replied by a deprecating shrug of the shoulders."[1]

That zealot for authority was Robert Cavelier de La Salle. Some time later he had the satisfaction of being summoned before a court of inquiry and contributing by his deposition to Fénelon's subsequent recall from Canada. As to that procedure in the chapel, even one of La Salle's most enthusiastic admirers characterizes it as indecent. But to comprehend its whole significance, a grain of Catholic experience seems to be wanted. La Salle, or his friends at least, on diverse occasions complained that the imputation of insanity had been cast on him by their common enemies. If such an impression had already at that period been tried to be made on the public, the persecuted schemer could have devised no better means to strengthen it than that very demonstration. Our people hardly ever witness similar scenes at their public religious exercises, unless the actor be the victim of some sort of hallucination, or actually beside himself. Could we have followed those simple worshippers at the Hotel Dieu, as returning to their homes they commented on the well-known adventurer's pantomimic performance, we might have observed many a significant jest suggestive of their suspicions. No one, of course, could fail to discover the logic at the bottom of that transient frenzy. Poor Robert was no longer a free man. Grasping at greatness—be it in the form of wealth, renown, or power—and convinced, as he must have been after six or seven years' chastening experience, that unaided by power it would be difficult for him to reach his goal, that independent spirit had sold himself to the party then, and prospectively for some time to come, in power. Having adroitly secured the new governor's confidence, and intent on ingratiating himself still more, he could not wish for an occasion more propitious than that party jar in Montreal and the Abbé's political sermon. In La Salle's mind, very likely, it was but a

[1] Parkman, Discovery of the Great West, p. 94 f.

duty of gratitude to side with his proud and imperious benefactor, right or wrong. Moreover, he had previously warned all persons against speaking ill of him in his presence. Thus he was doubly engaged. He, Robert Cavelier de La Salle, had spoken, and there was a man in the colony bold enough to slight his threats! This was unendurable. It called for some sort of chastisement, and the whip must be applied on the spot. Such seems to have been the mental process that led to that regretable demonstration. But, be this as it may, a man of La Salle's social standing and apparent sense of religious propriety would hardly have carried obsequiousness to such a length, or given vent to his anger in so unbecoming a manner, had there not been that in his mental constitution which, unless carefully guarded against, was apt to develop into monomania, or some kindred sort of mental aberration. An incident that occurred a few years later, plainly shows the peculiar form which that morbid disposition had then assumed.

While La Salle was occupied in strengthening Fort Frontenac, the intended base for his future operations, an attempt, it seems, was made to poison him. The person, one of his own household, arraigned for the crime and apparently convicted, tried to escape capital punishment by a stratagem. Knowing his master's violent prepossession against the Jesuits, he declared them to have been the instigators of the crime. This saved his life. For La Salle, only too glad to have clutched such a palpable proof of the Fathers' ill will, and loath to part at once with the living evidence, contented himself with putting the culprit in irons. It is true, the cross-examination or some circumstances of which no record remains soon, to his sorrow, convinced him of the falsity of the accusation; and, in order "not to give notoriety to the affair," he even went so far as to pardon the poisoner, a circumstance which places the whole matter in a somewhat doubtful light. But the mere fact, confessed by La Salle himself, that he believed the Jesuits capable of that crime, is plainly symptomatic of a mind disordered by the intensity of rancor or fear, or perhaps both combined. Nor is it difficult to surmise by what train of circumstances that noble body of missionaries had become the object of his dread or aversion.[1]

[1] The poisoning story can be found treated at some length in Parkman's Discovery, etc., pp. 110, ff. The name of the guilty person is said to have been Nicolas Perrot. Hence Parkman adds, in a note: "This puts the character of Perrot in a new light, for it is not likely that any other can be meant than the famous *voyageur*." On the contrary, it is exceedingly improbable that he was the man. Frontenac would hardly have rewarded the would-be murderer of his devoted servant and partner in the fur trade with the trading license (*congé*) which he granted Perrot soon after that affair. Nor is it likely that the great *voyageur* served La Salle in the quality of a *domestique*. The name "Perrot," now very common, was already then represented by more than one family in Canada. At any event, could there not be more than one Nicolas Perrot in a population of 9000 souls?

La Salle, as has been plausibly surmised from his whole future course, had come to Canada with the hope of there finding congenial occupation for his restless mind, and a field wide enough for a burning desire for achievement. How large a share vanity, the lust of power, and cupidity had in the forming of his plans from the very outset, it is impossible to determine. That those passions, in the progress of his enterprise, acted as a strong side-blast on the beacon-light which finally guided him to destruction, no one probably is inclined to deny. At any event, his purpose soon became to him a fixed idea, a very idol, fascinating his imagination and magnetizing every fibre of his stubborn will; and the natural effect of opposition, real or fancied, on that concentred, ill-balanced, and morbid mind was a partial obfuscation of his intellectual vision. Now, La Salle's immediate object, after making his apprenticeship in woodcraft and gaining some knowledge of the country, was to traverse the continent to the South Sea. This goal, in accordance with the opinion then prevailing, he hoped to reach by way of the still mysterious "Great River" of the West. Hence, his first more extensive excursions, as far as traceable, appear to have been undertaken with a view to discover and explore the Mississippi. How far he went on "that famous journey to China," whether he really explored the Ohio down to the rapids of Louisville, whether he was even the first of his countrymen that reached the headwaters of the Illinois, all this is wrapped in obscurity, and may ever remain a subject of fruitless discussion. One thing is certain; in the prosecution of his first far-reaching plan he was outstripped by a younger man, an obscure Canadian, and a friend of the Jesuits, who had themselves taken an active part in the rival exploit. Natures like La Salle's are but spurred by disappointment to more energetic action. From the day when Joliet himself, such is the supposition, returning from the Mississippi, communicated to him the news of his great discovery, it became La Salle's task not only to perfect but also to reap the full fruit of that successful enterprise. The navigation of the great river and its tributaries, the monopoly of trade throughout its valley, the commander in chief of the forces and forts needed for its protection, some vast feudal seignory in the most eligible part of that sunny empire, nay, farther on, the conquest of Cortez's great legacy to Spain, the discovery of De Soto's Eldorado, and the establishment of mercantile relations with China and Japan; such had now become the dream of La Salle's fevered brain. And not a mere dream, but the object of a determined purpose, for a doubt as to his ability to carry out any project, however great, never seems to have entered his mind. He was the man. Whoever dared stand in his path he held as an enemy; and should he ever happen to trip and stumble on his way to empire,

he would believe that a jealous foe must have placed the obstruction in his way.

Now, the Jesuits stood in his path or were likely to be met on it before long. He thought so at least. Those missionaries, certainly, had planned, prepared, and effectively co-operated in the discovery of the Mississippi with the expectation of being one day employed in the work of evangelizing the tribes that dwelt on its waters. This claim, though never urged, or at least not up to that time, was well founded. Were they not emphatically the fathers of the colony? The very name of New France would have been blotted out on the maps, perhaps before the middle of that century, had there been no Jesuits on the St. Lawrence. But for their truly Apostolic labors among colonists and natives, that feeble plant would have been nipped in the bud. If the Western Algonquins, with a remnant of Hurons among them—mercifully protected as they were by their French ally—still remained faithful and helped to support the straggling settlements on the St. Lawrence, it was mainly the Jesuits' work. Even the existing precarious peace with the upper Iroquois, but for which the southern road to the great lakes would have remained locked against French traders and adventurers, was due to Jesuit influence and watchfulness, no less than to De Courcelles' arms and Frontenac's policy. Add to this those Fathers' knowledge of aboriginal dialects, their experience in the Indian mission, their peculiar fitness for the task, vastly superior to that of any other body of laborers in the field; to slight such claims to consideration was worse than ingratitude, it was folly. Sound policy itself, even from a secular point of view, suggested their continued employment as forerunners of commerce and colonization. But Frontenac, with all his ability, could not see this; or, if he did, his self-interest in that instance prevailed over his patriotism. Blinded by prejudice and cupidity, and charmed with the acquisition of a tool so suitable as he conceived La Salle to be, the needy governor eagerly seized at the adventurer's apparently well-digested and plausible proposals. With the jealous and unscrupulous Count, violently prepossessed as he was against the Order, the exclusion of the Jesuits from the new field of operation was a foregone conclusion. As to their pretended claims, let him take care to disabuse the court and the influential at home. The publication in France of the Jesuits' yearly reports must be suppressed; the history of their past achievements as missionaries ridiculed, or consigned to the domain of fiction; their character maligned; their real aim, commerce and empire, exposed; Joliet's claims likewise set aside; and his and Marquette's journey of discovery caused to fall into oblivion, or treated as a fable. La Salle, on his part, employing the utterly inexperienced and far less able

but good-naturedly pliant Recollects in the religious department of the enterprise, will guard the new empire against the intermeddling of the crafty Jesuits. The plan was well laid. Nor was the instrument in that particular respect ill chosen. The resolute adventurer entered upon his task with signal zeal and docility. Thus, writing to a great protector and crazy Jesuit-hater in France, La Salle says concerning his enterprise:

"I have need of a strong protection for its support. It traverses the *commercial operations* of certain persons, who will find it hard to endure it. They intended to make a new Paraguay in these parts, and the route *which I close against them* gave them facilities for *advantageous correspondence with Mexico.* This check will infallibly be a mortification to them; and you know how they deal with whatever opposes them."[1]

In this passage, which surely gives no uncertain sound, the unhappy man furnishes the key to his animosity against the Jesuits and his constant dread of their intermeddling with his plans. To reach his end, the missionaries must be supplanted by the merchant. He is the aggressor; hence, his course must be justified. Let him care never so little for the censure of the world, he has a conscience. Its sting must be blunted. Against holy Religious and apostles of the faith, even La Salle would not willingly declare war, for with all his faults he is still a Christian. But to oppose a body of rival merchants, to supplant ambitious men and traitors to their country, to confound despicable hypocrites, this will be a lawful enterprise, a chivalrous task, a work deserving the applause of every friend of religion. Such, then, the Jesuits must be; and, being such, what may not he, their deadly opponent, look for at their hands? In this light, La Salle, with his heated imagination, viewed the work and character of those devoted laborers on the Indian mission. This was the excuse for his growing animosity and openly declared opposition to them.

Such, at least, seems to be the most charitable construction that can be put on La Salle's co-operation in the anti-jesuitical plot. How little or how much the craft of the time-server had to do with this ostentatious unfurling of his colors is impossible to decide. No doubt the service such a course rendered him was great, if not indispensable for the prosecution of his scheme. It was the condition of Frontenac's favor and co-operation. It secured the assistance, and loosened the purse-strings of other enemies of the Order in old and New France. This, however, may not justify the conclusion that La Salle's rancor and suspicions were but shrewdly feigned. To all appearance, his aversion to the Jesuits was in-

[1] Lettre de La Salle au Prince de Conti, 31 Oct. 1678. A longer extract from this letter can be found in Parkman's Discovery, etc., p. 111. The italics in the passage quoted are ours.

sanely sincere. He really thought them capable of, and ready for, any measure—however criminal—calculated to thwart his plans. There was more of the fool than of the knave in the making up of the unhappy man's character. It is charity to presume that he was not always *compos mentis*.

While the planning adventurer's imagination was thus haunted by fear or gloomy suspicions, his pride and undoubted courage led him to give vent to his feelings by bravados little consistent with his general religious bearing. Thus, alluding to his great protector's coat of arms, which had griffins as supporters, he would exclaim: "I will make the griffin fly above the crows;" designating by the latter term the innocent objects of his wrath. It would, indeed, be strange if this his frequent boast had not one day been visited with some condign and striking chastisement. At one time, however, the braggart prophecy was on the point of meeting with its literal fulfilment.

It was a proud day for the future viceroy of the Mississippi valley, when one of those western missionaries whom he came to supplant, had to impart his blessing to the successful rival, on his way to empire, and on the very spot from which Marquette had, six years before, set out with Joliet on their journey of discovery. This came to pass towards the end of August, 1679, when La Salle hearing mass in one of the Jesuit chapels at St. Ignace de Michilimackinac, knelt, conspicuous in his scarlet mantle bordered with gold, amidst a crowd of jealous traders and admiring natives. His mind, it is true, was somewhat embittered by the desertion of a number of his *voyageurs*, who, some time before, had taken to the woods laden with plunder. But some of them he is now about to capture; others will be brought to bay and escorted back by the faithful Tonty. His remaining followers he also fears are being sorely tampered with by wily rival merchants and subtle Jesuits. But let these poor men once be dragged from under those debauching influences, and all will be well. The losses already sustained will be made up, and the injury retaliated by further trading with the tribes that maintain those envious merchants. Though this be a violation of his patent and the very means of goading his rivals to redoubled action, sustained as he is by the governor, he has nothing to dread. Freighted with ample stores for his contemplated trading-house, and with materials for the building of a brigantine on the Illinois, his fifty-ton vessel, the Griffin, lies safely anchored in the tranquil little bay. Now the parting gun is fired, the sails catch the breeze, and cheered on by the yelling natives, the Griffin takes wing and starts on her flight "above the crows."

A few days sail on the virgin waters of Lake Michigan, and the

most advanced post of the Society—Green Bay—will be outflanked. There is but one solitary Father—Allouez—on the Illinois, the highroad to the adventurer's empire. With him he is determined to make short work if he dare await his approach. A few months, and outsailing the limits of Joliet's and Marquette's journey—if their story be true—the bold Norman will plant the arms of his king on the southern shore of the continent.[1] Thus La Salle sets out from Michilimackinac, his mind swelling with the proud consciousness of its powers and the all-absorbing thought, "I am the man." Alas for human pride!

Within about a fortnight, if nothing unforeseen happened, the Griffin was expected to touch again at St. Ignace on her homebound journey. From the headland, south of the settlement, many a keen eye of Indian or Frenchman, eager to signalize the return of the giant canoe, scans the southern horizon. The equinoctial storms have spent their fury. Calm and sunny days succeed. But no sail shows itself on the lonely expanse of water. November begins to fringe the margin of the lakes with a crust of ice. December congeals all their deeper recesses. Presently wind and currents send snowy fields or grinding fragments of ice adrift. The straits become choked, and navigation is brought to a close. All sorts of surmises, as to the probable fate of La Salle's bark, are rife, and, as is usual in such cases, the most contradictory rumors are afloat at the mission. One thing is evident,—the Griffin cannot have cleared the straits unperceived, even if the furs stored in Michilimackinac were to be left behind. Has a bird of higher flight and stronger beak pounced upon the winged monster?

The tardy spring rapidly passing into summer, will bring an answer. Like scattered plumage of a buzzard's prey, the disjointed members of the expedition will be seen dropping into the "Little Bay of the Hurons." One by one, four or five different parties, hailing from the south, the east, and the west, will be glad to drag their weatherbeaten canoes ashore, in sight of Marquette's grave; all sorely in need of food, or rest and shelter; some indeed bent on plunder, but each with their own woful tale of sufferings, perils, wrongs, losses, treason and disasters.

First comes, crossing over from the lower peninsula, the master carpenter, "*Maître Moyse*," with "*La Forge*," the blacksmith, and a few more fellow-knaves. Another batch of scoundrels soon follow. They are deserters from Fort Crèvecœur, where they have left an unfinished vessel on the stocks, with the inscription "*nous sommes tous sauvages.*" Their tale confirms the loss of the Griffin. To indemnify themselves for ill treatment, arrears, and disappoint-

[1] La Salle doubted, or affected to doubt, the truth of Joliet's discovery.

ment, they clutch La Salle's furs, and take up an easterly route, soon to be met by their master and shot or captured.[1]

The "pivot of the enterprise" himself is next to pay a visit to the mission. Driven by dire necessity from the Illinois to the St. Lawrence, straight through the wilderness and before the close of the winter, La Salle now returns to his task, creeping along the north shore of Lake Huron, with a new levy of recruits, in bark canoes deeply laden with another outfit for his unfinished brigantine. He lacks provisions. With these the rival establishment grudgingly supplies him. Pushing forward, he will find his forts demolished and not a trace left of the small faithful remnant of his party.

The commander has not gone far when the van of the expedition arrives at the mission. Luckiest of all, Wennepin and his two companions, escorted by their deliverer Du Lhut, come straight from the Falls of St. Anthony and Dacota captivity. Having first recruited at the Jesuits' table in Green Bay, they now take up winter quarters with those at Michilimackinac. Early in the spring, the future historian of the campaign, deserting the cause of his captain, bids farewell to his kind hosts, with little gratitude, but enough of adventure to feed his vanity for a lifetime.

The last batch of fugitives, the trustiest and most estimable of the party, are already near. While La Salle in the autumn coasted along the east shore of Lake Michigan, on his second journey to the Illinois, Tonty, with but three of the men and one of the friars, the other having been left on the prairie a food for wolves, were slowly winding their way through Eastern Wisconsin, living on acorns and roots, till they too reached Green Bay, wellnigh famished. Sheltered through the winter and revived under the Fathers' hospitable roof, they resumed their journey in the spring, and now in their turn become the guests of the Jesuits at St. Ignace.

Their stay, however, is but short. For La Salle returning from the scene of his ruined hopes on the Illinois, and paying his third visit to the mission, conveys those trusty friends back to Fort Frontenac.

In the autumn of the same year (1681) retracing his steps, with a new supply of men and stores, the untired adventurer passes St. Ignace for the fourth time within two years, a sadder and, it really seems, for some time to come a wiser man. If he never repented his old boast, he surely forbore the allusion to Frontenac's arms.

---

[1] The deserters left Fort Crèvecœur, on the Illinois, in two batches. They may, however, have joined on the way and arrived together at St. Ignace. The inscription on the vessel looks very much like a humorous allusion to a title the imprudent commander may sometimes have given to his most tried men.

Nor would it have been to the point. For, before another year elapsed, his great patron was recalled from power.

If the Jesuits in New France possessed a moderate share of that worldly wisdom which common opinion ascribes to the Society, they must by that time, at least, have understood that no intrigue of theirs was needed to make the infatuated explorer miss his goal. Did he really persist in ascribing his reverses to their plotting? The historian to whom we owe the most complete and elaborate life of La Salle assures us that his hero *always* saw the influence of the Jesuits in the disasters that befell him.[1] If this be true, and we have no right to doubt it, nothing short of an incipient stage of lunacy can have thus blinded the man to his own blunders. For, of that whole dark web of misfortune—"disasters, sorrows, and deferred hopes; time, strength, and wealth spent in vain; a ruinous past and a doubtful future; slander, obliquy, hate,"—whom could he, in his sober senses, accuse of having cast the woof? None but himself and his monstrous infatuation. If the Jesuits had a hand in his reverses they must have possessed the power to bewitch him.

It was especially one false step—an act of presumption and obstinacy quite in keeping with the adventurer's whole course—that caused the failure of his first attempt to reach the mouth of the Mississippi and gather the first fruits of his splendid monopoly of trade and colonization. A glance backward, at the events that immediately followed the sailing of the Griffin from Michilimackinac, suffices to show this.

La Salle reached the entrance of Green Bay only in September. His original plan was to pilot his vessel from thence to the mouth of the St. Joseph, near the southeast corner of Lake Michigan. From that plan he should not have departed. He might, of course, have perished on the way, and the world would have one great name less "to point a moral or adorn a tale." But provided he reached that point in safety, he would have arrived on the Illinois in the proper season, with ample stores, and especially with all the rigging and the anchors of a second bark, which he intended to build on that river. He could have erected and provisioned a strong fort, built his vessel, and, leaving a sufficient garrison under the able and humane Tonty, sailed down the stream early in spring and returned before the end of the season, or proceeded to the

[1] Discovery, etc., p. 389, note. Parkman has had rare opportunities to avail himself of La Salle's private letters and other manuscript documents, not generally accessible. Consequently he was well able to judge in that matter. But far from discovering in those dark suspicions and wanton accusations the working of a disordered mind, the author of the "Discovery" all through that work insinuates his own belief in the guilt of the Jesuits.

West Indies, exploring on the way the coast east of the Mississippi, and thus, in a measure, insuring the success of his intended return journey to its mouth. The men, let them be never so prejudiced, being in need of nothing, having but ordinary hardships to endure, and seeing success smile on the enterprise, would have had little temptation to desert; provided, of course, their leader had self-command and humility enough to temper in some degree his innate harshness and hauteur. The storm that swept over the Illinois country in the autumn of 1680, when an Iroquois war party attacked and scattered that tribe, would have blown over the French post with little or no damage. In a word, everything would have been placed on a foundation sufficiently solid to render even the loss of the Griffin, on her homebound journey, comparatively harmless, or at least not so utterly ruinous as it proved in consequence of her sailing directly from Green Bay.

Every consideration, then, of safety and expediency should have induced La Salle to carry out his original plan. An unexpected gleam of sunshine made him change it. Casting anchor at the entrance of Green Bay, he met with several of his traders, who, notwithstanding the presence of Jesuits in those parts, had remained faithful and were now returning with a large store of furs. This enabled him to dispatch to Canada the first token of his honesty and success. The continuation of his journey on the Griffin involved only a delay of a fortnight or less. But to wait, when a chance to show his prowess fell in his way, was not in La Salle's nature. He at once resolved to send his vessel back, laden not only with those furs, but also with the chief part of the stores on which depended the success of the whole enterprise. Himself, three friars, a Mohigan hunter, and ten followers, were to continue the journey in canoes. The murmurings of the men, several of whom were mechanics, probably unaccustomed to that mode of travelling, the opposite advice of every soberminded man in the party, and the remembrance of all his former mishaps, were not able to convince him of the imprudence of this course. His own short experience as a navigator should have taught him that the passage of the Griffin through the almost unknown waters of three great lakes and the intervening straits, and her safe return to the St. Joseph would be but a lucky chance. But he "who asked counsel of no man" would not reckon with possibilities, and setting his fortune on a cast pursued his course.

That horrid coasting journey along the western and southern shores of Lake Michigan tells its own tale. Its hardships and dangers have, indeed, furnished a fine subject for many pages of graphic and picturesque description; but to the victims of the blundering leader's obstinacy it was but sorry comfort to muse upon

the pleasurable emotions the tale of their adventures might some day afford to entranced readers, snug and comfortable at their firesides. That crew, perhaps already mutinously inclined, wanted little more than this sample of what there might still be in store for them in the service of the puny despot, to make them chafe under the lash and ready for desertion at the first favorable moment. There was no tampering needed. What, if he himself bore the brunt of every hardship and every danger? Before his inflamed imagination lay glory, wealth, empire, an imperishable name; his tools, the oarsmen and packers, might at best hope for a tardy payment of their paltry wages. Even so, those poor men could yet have been conciliated by some show of kindly feelings; harshness and haughtiness, always ineffectual with the French or Canadian hired man, were doubly pernicious under the circumstances; and of these ingredients in his character the unhappy man, according to the testimony of his very friends and admirers, never learned to divest himself. In this most important matter, the "immense power of his will," if ever applied in that direction, proved utterly at fault.[1]

La Salle, starting from the entrance of Green Bay about the middle of September and coasting around Lake Michigan, reached the mouth of the St. Joseph on the first of November. His obstinacy had cost him four or five weeks of time, doubly precious at that advanced season, and another month elapsed before Tonty and the bulk of the party, sadly broken up on the way, rejoined their leader. Their journey along the east shore, diversified as it was by perils, famine, losses, and desertion, had, like La Salle's, conduced more towards dispiriting the men than any amount of tampering could have done. And what caused this additional damage and vexatious delay? "Fortune and a throng of enemies" in league against that "tower of adamant?" Or rather cupidity, presumption, littleness of mind, and want of forecast?

The sending out of untried men to carry on an illicit trade in the midst of rival merchants was the first blunder. In this, however, Frontenac, whose clearsightedness was not always proof against his cupidity, must have had a hand. But to detach his ablest and trustiest followers with two-thirds of the party from the main body of the expedition, for the sake of capturing a few deserters, was La Salle's own work, and as ruinous a measure. Like so many

[1] Joutel, La Salle's faithful officer, and probably the most trustworthy among the historians of his last exploits, confesses that all his fine qualities were "counterbalanced by a haughtiness of manner which often made him insupportable, and by a harshness towards those under his command which drew upon him an implacable hatred, and was at last the cause of his death." Journal Historique, cited in Parkman's Discovery, etc., p. 364. It is strange that such a character should be held up for the admiration of American readers.

other acts of the rash and improvident adventurer, this betokens more the pettishness of a chagrined mind than the patient fortitude and perseverance of the "magnanimous hero," or the man born to conceive and carry out great plans. At any event the blunder once made, Tonty's return to Michilimackinac should by all means have been awaited, however humiliating it would have been for the wearer of the gold-bordered scarlet cloak to beg for food—he was already short of provisions—and pay exorbitant prices to his commercial rivals, or to ill-disposed Indians. Then came the third blunder and finishing blow, the staking of the whole enterprise on the return of the Griffin. No wonder that the expedition proved a failure. La Salle grasped at too much, and lost all.

He had, however, at last discovered, or been advised by his patron, that an entire change of plan was necessary, and finally made up his mind to what a wiser man would have done from the outset. Having "through the influence of Count Frontenac, the assistance of his secretary, Barrois, a consummate man of business, and the support of a wealthy relative," found means to appease his creditors and obtain some fresh advances, he renounced trading and shipbuilding and bent his energies to the execution of his principal object, the exploration of the Mississippi. Engaging a party of stalwart and trusty Indians, nearly equal in number with his French followers, he set out on his only successful journey of exploration with an humble flotilla of canoes. Sailing, without the loss of a man, to the point already reached by Joliet and Marquette, and some five hundred miles beyond it, he caught his first sight of the Gulf on April 17th, 1682. Two days later a column bearing the arms of France was set up on the shore, and a leaden plate with the inscription *Ludovicus Magnus regnat* lay safely buried in the ground.

With the usual ceremony, La Salle had claimed for France the extent of country that "stretched from the Alleghanies to the Rocky Mountains, from the Rio Grande and the Gulf to the farthest springs of the Missouri." He may have now honestly felt that he had the first claim, as the discoverer to all that vast empire or such parts of it as he chose. But will the much-tried schemer succeed in taking, and holding possession of it—overriding, of course, all Spanish pretensions?

Five years, less one month, have passed by. Two lonely travellers are winding their way through the sparse grass of a Texan prairie, some two hundred miles to the north of the mouth of the Colorado. To conclude from their worn and sunburnt faces and their garments patched with incongruous materials, their wanderings must have been long and toilsome. As to their present expedition, the subdued expression of their countenances indicates anything but pleas-

ant anticipations. These men are La Salle and one of his historians, the friar Anastase Douay. It is now ten weeks since their party, about twenty in all, has started from the Gulf and slowly travelled along in search of the Mississippi.[1] An equal number of persons, more than one-half of whom are women and children, remain behind on Matagorda Bay, at the mercy of exasperated Indians and jealous Spaniards.

It is hardly more than two years since the explorer, then bent on colonization and conquest, has thrown some two hundred and thirty human beings on that distant coast. What has become of five-sixths of them? A second great failure? Another signal defeat, at a distance of hundreds and hundreds of miles from the nearest spot where a labor-worn solitary Jesuit draws his breath? Have La Salle's enemies been plotting again, or what brought on the miscarriage of his last and grandest enterprise? Alas, he had himself amply provided for failure! The fate of the unfortunates that blindly intrusted themselves to his guidance was sealed when they embarked on the voyage that was to place the ocean between them and their native Normandy.

La Salle had succeeded even beyond his hopes in obtaining from the French Court the means for the execution of his long-cherished and persistently prosecuted scheme. Ships, arms, ammunition, supplies of every description were furnished him with royal munificence. But one thing was overlooked, one department of the preparatives carelessly, badly managed. Unfortunately it was the most important of all.

While the leader was engaged in some more dignified or congenial employment—rehearsing, perhaps, his nautical and strategetical studies—"faithless" agents, in Rochelle and Rochefort, swept the streets for *men*. Candidates for a hospital, beggars, vagabonds, all were welcome to the ranks of the little army. Thus, with soldiers that never handled a gun, and mechanics who had still to learn the first use of their tools, besides some women and children, and a few gentlemen who dreamed but of gold and estates, La Salle set out—to do what? Plant another Canada near the Tropics? Wrestle with Spain for the Mexican mines? It was on the latter plea, pre-eminently, that he had obtained his vessels and supplies. Two hundred Frenchmen, led by the great schemer, and supported by fifty buccaneers from St. Domingo and four thousand swarthy braves, all the way from the Illinois, were first to seize the most

[1] They averaged at most four miles a day, unless their route was very circuitous. Their course was not northeasterly, as Parkman says, but almost northerly, and if kept up, would have led them to the Canadian River, some fifty miles above its confluence with the Arkansas.

northern province of Mexico, and then to form a self-sustaining colony on the Lower Mississippi. And all this within twelve months. Almost too great an undertaking even for a La Salle to believe in its practicability! But, perhaps he has not yet matured his plans. Once on the field of operation, his genius, with its "quick adaptation to untried circumstances," will trace the details of a campaign, or lay out a city amid marshes and canebrakes. His faithful ally, Fortune, will do the rest.[1]

It seems to be generally understood that the only, or at least the main, causes of La Salle's last failure were his missing the mouths of the Mississippi and the loss of his vessels and principal stores. If neither of those misfortunes had befallen him the bubble must nevertheless have collapsed. That plethoric but effete body was sure to fall a prey to rapid consumption, on whatever spot of the new empire it might have been flung. A tree, hoary with age, dug

[1] The following is extracted from one of the two memorials in which La Salle sets forth his plans, and on the strength of which all his requests were granted. "The Sieur de la Salle offers, if the war with Spain continues, to undertake this conquest [of New Biscay] with two hundred men from France. He will take on his way fifty buccaneers at St. Domingo, and direct the four thousand Indian warriors at Fort St. Louis of the Illinois to descend the river and join him. He will separate his force into three divisions, and attack on the same day the centre and the two extremities of the province. To accomplish this great design, he asks only for a vessel of thirty guns, a few cannon for the forts, and power to raise in France two hundred such men as he shall think fit, to be armed, paid, and maintained, at the King's charge, for a term not exceeding a year, after which they will form a self-sustaining colony." Discovery, p. 105.

In the other memorial mention is made of the Indians *in the neighborhood of the Spaniards*, of whom an army of more than 15,000 could be formed; for they already love the French, "having been won over by the kindness of the Sieur de la Salle" (on his descent on the Mississippi). Parkman himself thinks that his hero was not madman enough to believe in the practicability of the object, and would rather have him be an unscrupulous follower of the maxim "the end justifies the means," than a crazy but honest schemer, and the dupe of his own pride-nurtured imaginations. The following passage is characteristic: "La Salle's immediate necessity was to obtain from the Court the means for establishing a fort and a colony within the mouth of the Mississippi. This was essential to his own commercial plans; nor did he in the least exaggerate the value of such an establishment to the French nation, and the importance of anticipating other powers in the possession of it. But he needed a more glittering lure to attract the eyes of Louis and Seignelay; and thus, it would appear, he held before them, in a definite and tangible form, the project of Spanish conquest which had haunted his imagination from youth, trusting that the speedy conclusion of peace, which actually took place, would absolve him from the immediate execution of the scheme, and give him time, with the means placed at his disposal, to mature his plans and prepare for eventual action. Such a procedure may be charged with indirectness; but it was in accordance with the wily and politic element from which the iron nature of La Salle was not free, but which was often defeated in its aims by other elements in his character." Pp. 307 f.

If such was La Salle's character, what were his charges against the Jesuits worth? Then, certainly they formed but a part of his whole well laid scheme of deception. In our opinion, a disordered state of mind had more to do with them than "indirectness." We incline to the same belief in regard to his plans of conquest.

up on the soil of France, shipped across the sea, and stuck into the mud of the Mississippi, would have had a better chance to live there and thrive than the bulk of La Salle's colonization party. On the other hand, had he himself been the great explorer, the man "of practical study and practical action," of "quick perception" and "careful forethought," such as he has been portrayed to us, then, with his "heroic sagacity" and "sublime magnanimity," with the "giant energy of his indomitable will," with his "constancy and elastic genius," and so many more superlative qualities, that made him "equal to any undertaking," he surely would in less than a year have extricated himself from the perplexed position in which a great mistake and his ridiculous pride, the main cause of Beaujeu's malevolence, had placed him. Once on the Mississippi, the small live nucleus which the party probably contained might have taken root and grown, but in no case more rapidly than did, fourteen years later, the colony planted by an equally intrepid but less presuming and far abler man, the Canadian Iberville. This, of course, would not have satiated the Norman's ambition. In quest of fame and wealth, he would surely have plunged into some new harebrained venture, and sooner or later come to an equally inglorious though perhaps less tragical end.[1]

To return to our two pilgrims. While they plodded along on that Texan prairie in search of some missing friends, gloomy suspicions concerning their fate kept the explorer's mind in anxious suspense. There were dangerous elements in his little company. Two of his surviving followers had embarked and lost their fortunes in the disastrous enterprise, and hence were less inclined to bear patiently with their commander's and partner's imperiousness and haughty reserve. One of the missing party was La Salle's cousin, a hot-headed and overbearing youth. Had he and his com-

[1] It would require twice the space at our command were we to analyze La Salle's strange procedures at and after his landing, or to follow him with a critical eye in his mysterious wanderings through Texas. His eulogists pass very lightly over the blunders of that period. It will be interesting, especially to those of our readers who have formed their estimate of La Salle's character and abilities from the perusal of Shea's "Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley," to see the conclusion to which an author of such sound and calm judgment has finally come in regard to that explorer's merits. "La Salle's course, after his shipwreck," says Mr. Shea, "shows him to have been, as an explorer, of the utmost incapacity. In descending the Mississippi, he merely followed the current a short distance beyond Marquette and Joliet's limit. Left to his own resources, he showed no energy, skill, or judgment. After discovering the Cenis he should have sent some on to find the Mississippi, as they would easily have done, and then brought up all his men from Fort St. Louis; but it is evident that he sent out no explorers, only went on, in a sort of grand heroic way, with no fixed purpose. To me, he seems a man prodigiously overrated, and that to actual incapacity all his misfortunes are properly to be ascribed. He was, doubtless, a persuasive and alluring talker in setting forth his projects, though utterly incapable of carrying out even the simplest." Shea's Charlevoix, vol. iv. 115, *note*.

panions fallen victims to the rage and despair of those miserable men? Then, the adventurer could not but dwell on that thought, his own turn will most likely be next. Under such circumstances his mind would naturally revert to past trials and perils. In fact, "all the way," writes Father Anastase, "he conversed with me of matters of piety, grace, and predestination, expatiating on all his obligations to God for having saved him from so many dangers during the last twenty years that he traversed America. He seemed to me peculiarly penetrated with a sense of God's benefits to him."[1]

It may not be unreasonable to presume that in this softened mood, and in thus surveying his adventurous and checkered career, La Salle should have wished some pages in the book of his life to be blotted out or rewritten. Ample time and experience had been granted him to get weaned from at least one of his crazy suspicions. Would he still cloak his mistakes with the fancied intrigues of the Jesuits? Or was not light at last dawning in his darkened mind? A growing consciousness of his manifold blunders, and even of his want of capacity, may for some time past have been struggling against his native pride. To draw the film from his eyes it still needed one of those beckonings of divine mercy, so often vouchsafed for the rescue of the erring, when their term of probation draws near its close. So long as a lingering hope of success remained that proud spirit would not yield. But the last ray of hope once quenched, and the certainty of final defeat presented to his mind, La Salle would not have been the Christian believer he remained to the end, had he not by an inward act of atonement prepared for the plunge into eternity. This mercy, it appears, was granted him. The shadow of his approaching doom fell on his mind, and the proud spirit which had hitherto borne him up suddenly gave way.

"All at once," continues Father Anastase, "I saw him plunged into a deep melancholy for which he himself could not account. He was so troubled that I knew him no longer." Did the long pent-up torrent of despair break forth in sighs and tears? Or was that inward agitation betrayed by no other sign but dull and speechless gloom? And did not at least one short, but effective, ray of light fall into that night of despondency, raising up the crushed spirit, no more to the vain hope of earthly grandeur, but to the abiding confidence of the humbled and contrite Christian? We know not. But, if such was the outcome of that gloomy hour it was well for La Salle, for ere the sun of that day went down the last scene of the tragedy was to be enacted.

His agitation subsided. An hour's walk brought the travellers

[1] Shea's "Discovery," etc., p. 213.

near the camp of the detached party they went in search of. The assassins stood prepared. While advancing with uplifted cane to chastise the insolence of a servant, La Salle received the ball that put an end to his earthly career.[1]

The enterprise whose success would have "closed the route" against the Jesuits, had failed through the incapacity and folly of its originator. The road was free again. "Heroes of another stamp took up the work which the daring Norman had begun. Jesuit missionaries, among the best and purest of their order, burning with zeal for the salvation of souls, and the gaining of an immortal crown, here toiled and suffered, with a self-sacrificing devotion which extorts a tribute of admiration even from sectarian bigotry. . . . With the beginning of the eighteenth century, the black robe of the Jesuit was known in every village of the Illinois. Defying the wiles of Satan and the malice of his emissaries, the Indian sorcerers, exposed to the rage of the elements and every casualty of forest life, they followed their wandering proselytes to war and to the chase; now wading through morasses, now dragging canoes over rapids and sand-bars; now scorched with heat on the sweltering prairie, and now shivering houseless in the blasts of January."[2]

Nor was the activity of the Jesuits confined to the mission among the Illinois tribe. The more southern parts of La Salle's coveted empire were likewise to witness the zeal and devotion of those Fathers, three of whom, in the early part of the last century, bedewed the soil of Louisiana with their blood.

The red man has disappeared from most of those regions, civilization has subdued the asperity and banished the terrors of the wilderness, but successors to the early Jesuits' toil and sacrifices are still in the field. On the whole line of La Salle's travels, and far beyond the goal of his golden dreams, from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf, on the Northern Lakes, and on Texan highlands and prairies, beyond the farthest sources of the Missouri and on the Pacific coast, men wearing the garb and animated with the spirit of the Marquettes, the Allouez, the Graviers, and the Marests, pursue their work of benediction, some as pastors, others as teachers of science, and some as wandering missionaries, messengers of love and reconciliation to the many-tongued children of the Church, as well as to the stray portion of Christianity in all those regions.

[1] Unfortunately Father Douay's account of La Salle's last hours cannot be relied upon as correct in all particulars. That writer appears not to have scrupled in inventing some statements calculated to console La Salle's relatives and, in fact, any Catholic who heard of his assassination. He makes him live an hour after being shot, "recapitulate a part of his life, receive absolution, and obtain a decent burial," all of which Joutel flatly and with the utmost probability contradicts. Douay's account of Moranget's death is subject to the same criticism. No similar reason, however, existed for inventing that fit of despondency, hence it may be looked upon as a fact.

[2] Parkman, Conspiracy of Pontiac, ii. 250, seventh edition, 1874.

It is an ungrateful task to descant on the faults of the fallen, but circumstances sometimes compel one to treat subjects from which he would otherwise shrink with abhorrence. The exposition of poor La Salle's errors could not but largely enter into a discussion, whose aim was the defence of our early Jesuit missionaries against old slanders, rehearsed in our days for the special purpose, it would seem, of cloaking the blunders, and bringing out in bolder relief the imaginary worth of their infatuated and unsuccessful opponent.

Providence seems to have placed that noble band of missionaries on the threshold of our national history, to serve both as models of purity, single-mindedness, zeal, and self-sacrificing devotion to their successors in a wider sense, the American Catholic clergy; and as a standing corrective for some of those traditional prejudices of which our separated brethren find it so hard to divest themselves. Hence, any attempt to tarnish the lustre of their virtues, be it by downright condemnation, or by artful insinuation, is an injury to the cause of truth and must be counteracted by all honest means in our power. There is too much of adulterated food offered to our reading public; and the more flattering some of it is to the palate the more pressingly a warning or an antidote is needed. Were it only the poor adventurer himself, or one of his chagrined admirers of the seventeenth century, that, in private letters or unpublished documents, accused those missionaries of plotting against him, by means the foulest and for ends the vilest, the charge might be let pass unnoticed. The case becomes different when the slander is countenanced by a modern author of high repute, an historian of great and accurate research in his chosen department, and withal a popular writer, whose historical narratives read like romances, and pass probably through the hands of not a few of our own Catholic youth. The defence then becomes imperative; and that unpleasant duty must not be shirked, though it imply severe handling of a popular idol, and the dispersion of an otherwise harmless illusion. The exposition of La Salle's defects and faults, however, forms but the negative side of this defence. Another and incomparably more attractive means of placing in their true light the character of La Salle's "enemies," the Jesuit missionaries of the latter part of the seventeenth century, will be to sketch the lives of a few of those wily plotters. But this must be deferred to some later opportunity.[1]

[1] The author of the "Discovery of the Great West" is too clearsighted an historian to be blind to the fact that no documentary evidence exists sufficient to substantiate the least of La Salle's charges, or those of his friends, against the contemporaneous Jesuits. Accordingly, he brings them forth in a certain guarded manner. His own *animus* and mode of attack may be illustrated by a few extracts. We italicize some of the *puncta salientia*.

On page 99 we read: "The Jesuits dreaded fur-traders, partly because they interfered with their teachings and perverted their converts, *and partly for other reasons.* But La Salle was a fur-trader, he aimed at occupation, fortification, settlement. The scope and vigor of his enterprises, and the powerful influence that aided them made him a stumbling-block in their path. *As they would have put the case*, it was the spirit of this world opposed to the spirit of religion; but I may perhaps be pardoned if I am constrained to think that the spirit which inspired these Fathers was not uniformly celestial, notwithstanding the virtues which *sometimes* illustrated it." This passage, to say nothing else of it, forms a singular contrast to one quoted in our text from the same author.

Sometimes the insinuation creeps in under cover of a note. Thus, on page 112, the second note runs as follows:

"In a letter to the king, Frontenac mentions that several men who had been *induced to desert* from La Salle had gone to Albany, where the English had received them well. . . . . *The Jesuits had a mission in the neighboring tribe of the Mohawks and elsewhere in New York.*"

In other words: "The parties were neighbors; their interests clashed; hence, *my man* must have been wronged." Many examples of this sort of circumstantial evidence might be adduced. The fact is that La Salle was comparatively safe where the Jesuits were nearest, and fared worse where they were farthest off. It would have been well for him and for the unfortunates he left on Matagorda Bay to be slaughtered and carried off by the Indians, if there had been Jesuit missions in the neighboring tribes. He lost all in Texas, because there these missionaries had not paved the road for him.

The *virus* that permeates the whole narrative has quite conspicuously precipitated in the *Index*, which, however, is not the work of the author, but credited by him to a Reverend gentleman (J. A. Vinton). There it stands plainly, *sub voce* La Salle: "*His misfortunes due to Jesuit malignity.*" Turning to the page referred to (389) we read:

"The Jesuit Allouez was lying ill at the fort [St. Louis of the Illinois]; and Joutel, Cavelier, and Douay went to visit him [on their way from Texas, after La Salle's death]. He showed great anxiety when told that La Salle was alive, and on his way to the Illinois; asked many questions, and could not hide his agitation. When, some time after, he had partially recovered, he left St. Louis, as if to shun a meeting with the object of his alarm. Once before, in 1679, Allouez had fled from the Illinois on hearing of the approach of La Salle."

Upon this way of acting on the part of Father Allouez, together with the circumstance that the wife of Beaujeu (the naval commander of La Salle's ill-starred expedition) was a friend of the Jesuits, and the fact that the Jesuits knew of La Salle's blunder before his surviving friends arrived in France, our author rests his own suspicion (whether La Salle himself entertained it, no one knows) that Beaujeu was but a tool in the hands of the Jesuits for the ruin of his hero. But let us hear himself (p. 389, *note*):

"Joutel adds that his [Allouez's anxiety] was occasioned by 'une espèce de conspiration qu'on a voulu faire contre les interêts de Monsieur de La Salle.'"

"La Salle always saw the influence of the Jesuits in the disasters that befell him. His repeated assertion that they wished to establish themselves in the Valley of the Mississippi [undoubtedly, even before La Salle had heard the name], receives confirmation from a document entitled, '*Mémoire sur la proposition à faire par les R. Pères Jésuites pour la découverte des environs de la rivière du Mississippi et pour voir si elle est navigable jusqu'à la mer.*' It is a memorandum of propositions to be made to the minister Seignelay, and was apparently put forward as a feeler before making the proposition in form. It was written after the return of Beaujeu to France [how soon?] and before La Salle's death became known. It intimates that the Jesuits were entitled to precedence in the Valley of the Mississippi, as having first explored it. It affirms that *La Salle had made a blunder and landed his colony not at the mouth of the river, but at another place* (the italics are the author's), and it asks permission to continue the work in which he has failed. To this end it petitions for means to build a vessel at St. Louis of the Illinois, together with canoes, arms, tents, tools, provisions, and merchandise for the Indians; and it asks for La Salle's maps and papers, and for those of Beaujeu.

On their part, it pursues, the Jesuits will engage to make a complete survey of the River and return an exact account of its inhabitants, its plants, and its other productions."

"How did the Jesuits learn that La Salle had missed the mouths of the Mississippi? He himself did not know it when Beaujeu left him; for he dated his last letter to the minister from the 'Western Mouth of the Mississippi.' I have given the proof that Beaujeu, after leaving him, found the true mouth of the river, and made a map of it. Now *Beaujeu was in close relations with the Jesuits, for he mentions in one of his letters that his wife was devotedly attached to them.* These circumstances, taken together, may justify the suspicion that Jesuit influence had some connection with Beaujeu's treacherous desertion of La Salle; and that his complicity had some connection with the uneasiness of Allouez when told that La Salle was on his way to the Illinois."

This contains by all odds the strongest evidence the author of the "Discovery" has been able to bring up for the support of La Salle's suspicions and his own insinuations. It is to be regretted that the exact date of the memorandum has been withheld. Probably there was no means for ascertaining it. But let that be as it may the document is quite harmless. For,

1. Allouez *first* flight in 1679, could have no possible connection with a "conspiracy" whose object was to frustrate La Salle's expedition of 1684. Now, if that Father saw fit to avoid a meeting with the explorer in 1679, there is no need of presuming any *new* cause for his uneasiness at the later occasion. The first sufficed, and this was simply his knowledge of La Salle's character and intentions. He acted wisely by going out of his way. Of all Jesuits, Allouez appears to have been the one against whom La Salle was most violently prejudiced. He had uttered threats against him before he reached the Illinois, and would not have hesitated to use violence in expelling him from his domains, as an enemy and traitor. If certain accounts are to be credited, La Salle accused Allouez of having had a hand in the attempt of his rival merchants to excite the Illinois against him. To clear the Father of this charge "we need no better proof than the friendly relations between him and Tonty, than whom there was surely no man more faithful to the interest and honor of La Salle." (Shea, Discovery, 69, *note.*) For the present purpose, however, it suffices to show that Allouez's anxiety at the supposed approach of La Salle is fully accounted for without presuming his knowledge of or co-operation in the fancied plot of 1684.

2. "How did the Jesuits learn that La Salle had missed the mouths of the Mississippi?" One would distrust his own eyes in reading this triumphant question, if the strange effects which *Jesuit-phobia* produces even on the clearest minds and brightest intellects were not so well known to us all. There was no need of any close relation between the Jesuits and Beaujeu for the former to learn the fact in question. La Salle's blunder may have become known then through another channel. The news of it must have reached France fully a year before his death was known. And not only the Jesuits, but any person who took an interest in American affairs, may have become acquainted with the fact. The "Discovery" itself contains all the dates and statements necessary to prove this.

Cavelier brought the news of his brother's death to France in October, 1688. Two years and eight months before this date, Tonty, having in Michilimackinac learned the abandoned state of La Salle's colony (as reported in France by Beaujeu) hastened to his succor, and not finding him on the Mississippi, searched the coast for some thirty leagues on either side without, of course, finding him. *This established the fact of La Salle's having "made a blunder, and landed his colony not at the mouth of the river, but at another place."* Returning in April, Tonty may have reached the Illinois in time to send an account of his expedition to Canada before the departure of the last vessel. In this case the news would have reached France two years before Cavelier's arrival. This, however, is a mere possibility. On the contrary, it is improbable in the last degree that the result of Tonty's search should have remained unknown in Canada up to the departure of the vessels in the fall of the following year, 1687. Tonty was not the man to be silent, or dilatory when the lives and safety of his fellow-beings—among them his revered commander—seemed to depend on openness and dispatch. The communication between the Illinois and Quebec was at that period quite regular and

rapid enough to allow the transmission of such news in the course of the season. In fact, Tonty himself that same summer went as far as the outlet of Lake Ontario to assist in the Iroquois war. Accordingly the Jesuits in France (who are supposed to have inspired that memorandum) may—or let us rather say, must—in this manner have heard of La Salle's blunder before the end of 1687 (a year before his death became known), whether Beaujeu knew of that blunder or not, and whether his wife was devoutly attached to them or otherwise.

So much for this point, which is the strongest in the case of "La Salle and friends *vs.* The Jesuits." Some minor issues, which might form proper subjects for a debating society, would be the following: Did Beaujeu betray La Salle? How could he know that one of the rivers emptying in Matagorda Bay was not a western branch of the Mississippi, when La Salle himself thought so? Could he assert with any degree of assurance that La Salle had made a blunder? And supposing he could, was he bound to secrecy? Is there any need of assuming a criminal understanding between him and the Jesuits, even if they obtained the news through him directly, or through any person to whom he chose to communicate them?

This paper must not be concluded without mentioning that grave doubts exist as to the fact of La Salle's ever having been a member of the Society of Jesus. The state of the question will be best shown by the following extracts from two American writers who hold opposite views. Parkman thinks the statement regarding his early connection with the Jesuits to be probably true. "Margry," he adds in a note, "after investigations at Rouen, is satisfied of its truth. Journal Général de l'Instruction Publique, xxxi. 571. "Family prayers of the Caveliers, examined by the Abbé Faillon, and copies of some of which he has sent to me, lead to the same conclusion. We shall find several allusions hereafter to La Salle's having in his youth taught in a school, which, in his position, could only have been in connection with some religious community. The doubts alluded to have proceeded from the failure of Father Felix Martin, S.J., to find the name of *La Salle* on the list of novices. If he had looked for the name of *Robert Cavelier*, he probably would have found it. The companion of La Salle, Hennepin, is very explicit with regard to this connection with the Jesuits,—a point on which he had no motive for falsehood." Discovery, p. 2, *note*. Could it be possible that the name Robert Cavelier was unknown to Father Felix Martin? The following is from Shea's Charlevoix, iii. 197, *note*: "Robert Cavelier de la Salle was born at Rouen in 1643. The statement here [in Charlevoix's text] made of his having been a Jesuit is on the authority of Hennepin in Nouvelle Découverte, Avis ou Lecteur, p. 107, which states that he had been among the Jesuits ten or eleven years, and taught in one of their colleges. He professes to have seen the document of the General of the Society of Jesus releasing him from his vows; but Father Felix Martin, on examining the catalogues of the French Provinces of the time in order to obtain the date of his birth, entrance into the Order, as well as the year when his name ceased to be given, failed to find any trace whatever of him. It is, therefore, most probable that Hennepin was mistaken. The assertion is, however, repeated by Mr. Faillon, Histoire de la Colonie Francaise, iii. 228, who seems to adduce family papers to sustain it. Yet as he is said to have been only a novice, it is not easy to see how he could have been treated as *civiliter mortuus*, and deprived of his inheritance."

THE SYRIAC FERIAL OFFICE.

Officium Feriale, juxta ritum Eclesiæ Syrorum Maronitarum Innocentii X., Pont. Max. jussu editum: denuo typis excusum regnante Pio VIII. P. O. M. Editio tertia. Romæ (ex Typographia Sac. Congr. de Prop. Fide), 1830, 8vo.

Idem . . . . regnante Pio IX. P. O. M. Editio Quinta (same place and printers), 1863, 16mo.

Ctobo d'metcane Shhimo, etc. (The book which is named Simple, or Ferial; that is, the Prayers of the Canonical Hours for all the Days of the Week according to the rite of the Church of the Syrians), Officium Feriale juxta ritum Ecclesiæ Syrorum S. Congr. de Prop. Fide jussu editum. Romæ (Typis S. Congr. de Prop. Fide), 1853, 8vo.[1]

THE Church here below on earth is one in spirit with the Church above in heaven. Though the former is only heir to the promises which have been fulfilled in the latter, though she is but fighting her way to that inheritance of which the other has already entered into possession, yet they are united by a loving bond of communion which no distance of time or place, no inequality of condition, can weaken or sever. The chief, indeed the perpetual occupation of Angels and Saints in the heavenly Sion is to contemplate the face of Deity; and the wonder, the love, born of this contemplation, is so intense that it cannot be pent up within the recesses of the soul but must find utterance in burning canticles of joy and praise, glorifying and exalting God and His attributes. On the other hand, the citizens of the earthly Jerusalem yet toil and groan, weighed down by the burden of the body, as the Wise Man complains.[2] But love seeks after thorough resemblance and begets imitation. And so, though incapable of perfect, much less continuous contemplation or incessant sacred song, they strive in proportion to their weakness to follow in the footsteps, and to become the rivals of their brethren above,

Almæ Sionis æmuli.[3]

[1] For brevity sake, in the course of the article, the first two will be designated by the initials "O. M." (Officium Maronitarum), and the third, by the initials "O. S." (Officium Syrorum).

[2] "For the corruptible body is a load upon the soul, and the earthly habitation presseth down the mind." Wisdom ix. 15.

[3] Hymn at Lauds in office for Dedication of a Church. The whole stanza, which suggested what has been said in the text, is well worth quoting:

"Sed illa sedes coelitum
Semper resultat laudibus,
Deumque Trinum et Unicum
Jugi canore prædicant:
Illi canentes jungimur
Almæ Sionis æmuli."

Hence, we find that from the very first day of her existence the children of the Church, both in the East and in the West, were taught to praise God as often as they could with hymns and psalmody. Though it was a duty, the eagerness and alacrity with which they fulfilled it made them almost lose sight of the fact, or at least prevented their feeling, that there was in it a bond of obligation. At all events, it was for them, what their Lord had declared His Gospel Law to be, a light burden, a sweet yoke, which excluded all sense of weight or weariness. But after the Apostles, as St. Augustine says, had slept the sleep of the departed just, the enemy of man crept into the Master's field and stealthily oversowed tares among the wheat. The Christian people began by degrees to abate in fervor. And as time rolled on, the loss of fervor went on increasing. It is a fact which may be deplored but cannot be denied, for the Holy Fathers are witnesses to it by their repeated tears and expostulations. Nor does such admission injure the Church. The prevarication of Judah in the Old Testament did not prevent her being the only depositary of God's revelation. So, too, in the New Law. In spite of the gradual loss of Christian fervor God would not—indeed, without denying Himself, as the theologians term it—*could* not strip His Church of that prerogative of sanctity with which He had invested her, and which He had designed as one of the marks which before men and in all ages was to distinguish His true spouse from the harlots, who at various times would dare to usurp that sacred name. There were then, as in all succeeding ages and generations, very many in her communion who were just and holy; many, whose sanctity shone with lustre before the word; many, too, the perfume of whose virtues, like that of fragrant flowers in the untrodden primeval forest, was lost upon their fellow-men, but ascended unseen like sweet-smelling incense before the throne of their Father in Heaven. Yet it is too true even in the annals of the early Church, that many no longer resembled those who had been trained in the primitive school of the Apostles and their immediate disciples. They retained, indeed, the Faith handed down by tradition and taught by the Church; but too often conformed themselves to the pattern of this world, allowing "the cares, and riches, and pleasures of this life"[1] to fill their souls and absorb their waking hours. They received the word of God from His Holy Church and held it in reverence; but these thorns, as our Saviour calls them, by which it was surrounded, choked its growth and rendered it fruitless.[2] Forgetting whose disciples they were, they anxiously thought of the morrow, they became solicitous about food and raiment, and other things after

[1] Luc. viii. 14. [2] Ibid.

which the Gentiles seek, and they had no time to obey Christ's injunction: Pray without ceasing.[1]

The evil was such as to call for the interposing hand of Church authority, and her legislation was a proof of her wisdom. Precepts couched in general terms, like those of fasting, almsgiving, and prayer, are amply sufficient in a period of universal fervor; but when this abates, when the charity of many has grown cold, their very generality or indeterminateness becomes a pretext to elude their obligation. We see this verified daily in the great crowd that makes bold to call itself Christian, though living outside of Christ's One True Church. If questioned, they will admit that fasting is good and even necessary. They cannot in decency deny it, without renouncing the idol they have set up for worship, viz., the dead letter of Scripture, as thorough an idol as were the golden calves of old in Dan and Bethel.[2] But do they obey Scripture and fast? No, but they do worse; it is their delight to mock and ridicule those who obey the Word and mortify themselves by fasting. Hence, guided by the wisdom of Him who "knoweth our frame," the Church, to make sure of our obedience, took these precepts, more or less, out of their general, indeterminate form, and defined them by adjuncts of time, place, and other circumstances which should take away from her lukewarm children every shadow of excuse, every chance of self-deception. Thus the time, the mode, and measure of fasting were enjoined by special legislation in synods and councils; almsgiving was regulated by the living voice of the pastors of the Church, either in the course of public penance or in the secret tribunal of private confession. In the same way, to secure the perpetual sacrifice of prayer and praise in the kingdom of God upon earth, the Church prescribed all details concerning the Divine Office by successive enactments for the Clergy.

In regard to the time, however, she did not need to cast about for special hours of her own devising. These had come down from the days of the Prophets and Apostles, and had been carefully observed all along by those who were faithful to this duty. All that was necessary was to stamp them with the seal of her authority. And thus the traditional hours of prayer, through her positive sanction, became what they now are called, Canonical Hours.[3] The Royal Prophet, the model of penitents and of those whose life is a never-ending cycle of supplication and praise, had centuries before laid down the stated times in which it was his habit to turn aside from earthly cares, whether of his kingdom or

[1] Luc. xviii. 1; I Thess. v. 17.

[2] III Kings, xii. 28, 29.

[3] Canonicæ appellantur, id est Regulares, quia juxta Regulam Ecclesiasticam. Gavantus, Thes. Sacror. Rit. Venetiis, 1791, tom. iii. p. 1.

his household, to engage in prayer and psalmody. "Evening, morning, and at noon, I will speak and declare,[1] and He shall hear my voice." "In the night I have remembered Thy name, O Lord! I rose at midnight to give praise to Thee" (Ps. liv. 18; cxviii. 55, 56). They had, too, the example of Daniel, who was accustomed thrice a day, with his face turned towards Jerusalem, to kneel down and adore and give thanks before his God (Dan. vi. 10); and of the Apostles, who at the third, sixth, and ninth hour prayed either in the temple or in the solitude of their chamber (Acts ii. 15; iii. 1; x. 9). Thus night and day had each its allotted hours of petition, thanksgiving, and praise. And the early Christians, though much given to extraordinary times of prayer, as the devotion of each moved him—laboring in fact, as far as human frailty would allow, to make of life one perpetual, unceasing prayer—yet would not suffer the ardor of private devotion or the promptings of private judgment to interfere with what they believed an established standard of prayer-time, laid down in Holy Writ, consecrated by the example of Prophets and Apostles, and acknowledged by the consent of Christians throughout the world. They had heard from holy David that seven were his prescribed hours of prayer;[2] and to these they wished to adhere as to a fixed rule, whilst prayer at other hours was to be the mere outcome of voluntary devotion. St. John Chrysostom is a witness to the universal obedience yielded (even at the close of the fourth century) by all good Christians to this rule of life, not enjoined but merely commended by David's example. All good and pious men, says the Saint, address their prayers to God seven times a day. They rise at night; they salute with thanksgiving the rising of the sun; they keep the third hour, because in it the Holy Ghost was given to the Apostles; the sixth, in which Christ was crucified; the ninth, in which He shed His blood and yielded up His spirit. At sunset they give thanks for the day that has passed, and pray once again before betaking themselves to sleep.[3] How David's words were to be adapted to the usual times of the Divine Office was not a settled matter, and various explanations were given. The prayers after midnight, at the dawn, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, and Vespers or Evening song gave but six hours. As a matter of private devotion, prayers before bedtime formed the seventh; but this

---

[1] St. Jerome (not the Vulgate) translates "loquar et resonabo." Biblioth. Div. Ps. lv. 18.

[2] "Septies in die laudem dixi Tibi" (seven times a day I give Thee praise). Ps. cxviii. 164.

[3] S. Joan. Chrysost. in Ps. 118. In the text the Saint's meaning is condensed rather than literally translated.

was not a Canonical Hour, having no place in the Liturgy. St. Basil[1] saw the difficulty, and solved it by dividing the sixth hour into two, part of the prayers being recited before, and the remainder after the midday repast. St. Benedict, to complete the number of seven hours, instituted Complin, by elevating night prayer to the dignity of a Canonical Hour. From that time to the present, the order of the Office in the Latin Church has been invariably as follows: I. The Night Office, or Nocturns (now called Matins), followed by Lauds. II. Prime, or first hour of the day. III. Tierce, or third hour. IV. Sext, or sixth hour. V. None, or ninth hour. VI. Vespers, or Evening song. VII. Complin, or close of the Office.

In the Syriac Church there are also seven Canonical Hours, which we shall enumerate, with a few remarks wherever it may seem necessary. I. VESPERS (*Ramsho*, or Evening), which is considered the first in place. It begins the office of every day, feast or ferial, just as in the Latin Church all festivals date from the first vespers, viz., those of the preceding day. This is based on the Levitical law, "From evening until evening you shall celebrate your Sabbaths" (Levit. xxiii. 32). So thoroughly has this idea taken possession of the Eastern mind, that they apply to the liturgical what can only belong to the natural day. Hence, as Evening Song is the first Canonical Hour, they call it indifferently the hour of *Ramsho* (evening), or of *Nogah* (dawn, daybreak). See O. M., ed. 1863, pp. 2, 79, 147, etc.. Something of the kind may be seen in St. Luke xxiii. 54, where the Evangelist says, that it was Friday evening, and that the Sabbath was *dawning* (Gr. ἐπέφωσκε, Vulg. *illucescebat*). But our Douay translators and their Anglican copyists, thinking the metaphor too bold for Western ears, have softened it into "the Sabbath drew near." Luther, with more courage and fidelity, has "Der Sabbath *brach an*." The Psalms used at Vespers are the 50th (*Miserere*), the 140th (*Domine clamavi*), the 141st (*Voce mea*), and the little *Laudate* (Ps. cxvi). Two of these, the 140th and 141st, are also used in the Roman Breviary at the Vespers of Friday; the little Laudate at the Vespers of Monday, and the first Vespers of Festivals. The O. S. has the same psalms as the O. M., but adds at the end the portion of St. Matthew that refers to the Resurrection of Our Lord (Matt. xxviii. 1–5). The fact that it is in Karshunic proves that the Vespers were supposed to be attended by the laity, for whose benefit the Gospel was read. Karshunic means nothing more than Arabic written in Syriac characters. The Syrian Christians are compelled

[1] Serm. I. de Institut. Monachor. Paris, 1618, tom. iii. 294.

to use the Arabic vernacular of their Saracen masters, but they will not allow its letters to desecrate their sacred books, where sometimes the rubrics, etc., are in Arabic. As to the Maronites, Assemanni testifies that the laity are accustomed to attend the Morning service, Vespers, and even the Night office. (Bib. Orient. tom. ii., Diss. de Syr. monoph. § 10.)

II. COMPLIN. This is known as *Sutoro*, and from its etymon *star* (texit, to cover, protect),[1] means either simply a "going under cover," *i. e.*, retiring to rest, or perhaps (though less probably) a prayer for "protection" during the night. The former is the way in which the word is translated by G. Fabi. Boderianus, in his ed. of Severus de Rit. Baptismi. As the book is extremely rare, we add the title in full: "D. Severi Alexandrini quondam Patriarchæ de Ritibus Baptismi et Sacræ Synaxis apud Syros Christianos receptis Liber nunc primum in lucem editus, Guidone Fabricio Boderiano excriptore et interprete; Antuerpiæ, ex officina Christophori Plantini, Regii Prototypographi MDLXXII." So rare is this little quarto that some have been led to doubt of its existence, as we are told in the "Annals of the Printing-house of Plantini," p. 120. But this was unreasonable, as the book has been quoted by many authors, amongst others by Edmund Castell, who used it in preparing his Syriac Lexicon. There is a copy, most probably the only one in the country, in the Library of St. Charles's Theological Seminary, at Overbrook, Pennsylvania. On page 129, occurs a Syriac prayer, headed "Ssluto hhlito d' Mor(i) Aphre(i)m b'shohat *sutoro*," which Boderianus translates, "Precatio excitatoria D. Ephrem hora *absconsionis*," or "A prayer to arouse one's self (to quicken spiritual attention) at the hour of *hiding*." It should have been "A miscellaneous prayer at the hour of Complin." *Hhlito* is simply, the Latin participle *mixtus*. The same prayer, or rather hymn, is yet used in the Syriac Office, and may be found more correctly printed at the end of Sunday's Complin, in the O. M., ed. 1863, p. 21. Guido Fabricius Boderianus, in the vernacular Guy Le Fevre, Sieur de la Boderie (a family fief in Normandy) was a good scholar for his day, and had a hand in preparing the Antwerp Polyglot of 1572. We are not able to fix the date when Complin was introduced into the Syriac office. It was certainly unknown in the early Church both of the East and of the West. Some have thought they could discern traces of it in the writings of St.

[1] The idea of *hiding* or *secrecy* is also contained in this root, though unknown to Castell and Michaelis. Their dictionary likewise omits the words *stiroit* (secretly) and *stiruto* (concealment), which are found in St. Ephraim. Cf. Gustav. Bickell in Glossar. ad S. Ephræmi Carmina Nisibena. *Stiro* in the sense of "hidden" may be found in a hymn of St. James of Sarug. O. M. (Roman ed. of 1863), p. 488, lin. 5.

Cyprian,[1] St. Ambrose, and St. Basil.[2] The Rule of St. Augustine and that also of St. Jerome, used to be quoted in support of the antiquity of Complin; but now it is well known that they are not the work of those holy doctors whose names they bear, but of a much later date. Gavanti assumes without a shadow of reason, that Cassian (who died A.D. 433) introduced the new Hour into the monasteries of Gaul. But Cardinal Bona, Merati, and other able liturgical writers agree in the opinion that its origin is owing to St. Benedict, in whose Rule (ch. 42) it is first mentioned. The short hymn, which is now used at Complin, *Te lucis ante terminum*, is attributed to St. Ambrose. But even if it were his, which is very doubtful, it would not prove that Complin was known in his time. The prayer "*Visita quæsumus Domine*," which we recite at the end of this Hour, was originally no part of the office, but was recited by the Superior in the Dormitory, as its very words indicate,[3] while sprinkling the hall with Holy Water, before the monks retired to rest.[4] It was probably adopted from the Carthusian Breviary, where it is yet found, but with the rubrical direction that it is to be recited by each monk in his cell before bedtime, not in the Church. The prayer formerly said *in choro*, where we now say the "*Visita*," varied according to time and place. In some Breviaries it was very short, as in those of Bourges and Lyons; that in the Breviary of Augsburg was longer, and longer still that which is found in the Liturgy of the Church of Milan, or Ambrosian rite, and which (since the days of St. Charles, at least) is followed immediately by our "Visita." As a specimen of said prayer, we give from Martene one used by the Benedictines as far back as the second century of the Order's existence, say about A.D. 650 or 660. "Suscipe, Domine, preces nostras et muro custodiæ tuæ hoc sanctum ovile circumda; ut omni adversitate de-

---

[1] According to the opinion, more fanciful than correct, of Suarez (De Hor. Canon. lib. iv. cap. v. 9), the words of the Saint, "Recedente sole ac discedente (the Saint's true words are *die cessante*) orandum est," indicate Vespers and Complin. But it was not St. Cyprian's purpose to make such a distinction. The sun's withdrawing and day's departure are only an amplified expression for sunset. Consult the passage itself in Maran's edition of St. Cyprian (De Orat. Dominica, near the end).

[2] The passage of St. Basil referred to above is decisive on this score. Had he known of Complin, he would not have resorted to the expedient of dividing Sext in order to find David's seven hours in the office. See Azevedo, Exercitationes Liturg. Romæ, 1750, pp. 16, 125.

[3] "Visit, we beseech thee, O Lord, this dwelling, and drive far from it all the snares of the enemy. Let Thy holy angels *dwell therein*," etc. The protecting presence of the angels could not be asked for the Church or Sanctuary, in which Catholic faith holds that angels dwell day and night, adoring Him who lies hid under the sacramental veil.

[4] Azevedo, ibid. p. 127; Merati (in notis ad Gavant), sect. iv. cap. 6, De Compl. Venetiis, 1791, tom. iii. p. 121.

pulsa, sit hoc semper domicilium incolumitatis et pacis. Per Dominum nostrum," etc.[1] The Canticle of Simeon "*Nunc Dimittis*," though enjoined for the end of Vespers by the Apostolic Constitutions, and most appropriately transferred to the end of Complin in the Latin Breviary, is not used either at Vespers or Complin in the Syriac office. In the Complin as instituted by St. Benedict, there were but three Psalms, the 4th, the 90th, and 133d. The fragment of the 30th Psalm now found in the second place, was not introduced until long after. It is unknown to the Syriac Complin. The O. S. agrees with the Latin Church in reciting the 4th and 90th Psalm; the O. M. has only the 90th "*Qui habitat.*"[2] The O. S. has in addition the 122d Psalm (*Ad Te Levavi*). The 133d, "*Ecce Nunc Benedicite*," is transferred in both offices to the beginning of *Lilio*, or Night Service. The Nestorian Syrians call their Complin by the name of Suboho (*h* for Ain), because it is recited after supper. The word literally means *saturitas*, or *saturatio;* though neither in its literal nor acquired meaning has it yet found its way into any Lexicon. It corresponds perfectly, both in sense and liturgical time, with the Ἀπόδειπνον of the Greek Office. That it is strictly an ecclesiastical term, appears from the Nestorian writer, Ebedjesus of Soba, who in his "Epitome of the Canons," remarks that this Hour "is called Suboho by those who fast all the days of their life, but by those who live in the world it is named Da' Kdom Madmco, the (hour) *before sleep*." (Assem. Bib. Orient. Tom. iv. p. 339.)

III. *Lilio* (night, *i. e.* Nocturns or Night Service) is composed of *kaume* or stations, which divide it into parts resembling the Nocturns of the Latin Office. The Greeks, too, have "stations" not only in their Night Office but also through the other hours; "because," says Azevedo,[3] "at the beginning of each station two come forward and recite it standing, while the others remain seated." On what authority this reason rests does not appear, nor is the

[1] "Receive, O Lord, our prayers, and surround this holy fold with the wall of Thy protection, so that free from all hostile attack this may ever be the abiding-place of security and peace," etc. Apud Martene, De Antiquis. Eccl. Ritibus. Venetiis, 1783, tom. iv. p. 40. Martene (we should have stated this before, for he is no mean authority) insists that St. Basil, and not St. Benedict, was the first to introduce Complin; but he does not pretend to answer the objection taken from his sermon De Instit. Monachor. quoted above.

[2] In the Syriac Psalter, as in the Hebrew, this is the 91st Psalm. Its use at the close of daily prayer seems to have come down from the earliest times of the Church. St. Basil says that the 90th Psalm must necessarily accompany the prayers that are said before the night's repose. It is strange that Azevedo (Exercit. 8 Quinam fuerint Eccl. Orient. ritus in celebr. Div. Off. p. 30) should assert, that in the Maronite office Complin has three Psalms. It has but one, unless the two editions we have placed at the head of this paper differ materially from the first Roman edition, printed over two hundred years ago, supposing Azevedo to have consulted it.

[3] Exercit. Liturg. p. 28.

statement itself for which the reason is given altogether correct. He seems to confound the καθίσματα (sessions) of the Greek Office with the στάσεις (stations). The καθίσματα were originally divisions of the Psalter, twenty in all (not twenty-four, as Azevedo says), each καθισμα comprising more or less Psalms according to their length. Each καθισμα is subdivided into three parts, each of which is called a στάσις or *station*. For this name Leo Allatius[1] offers two reasons: either because "they recite standing, or because at the end they pause to take breath." The latter, no doubt, is the true reason. The word κάθισμα came gradually to mean any interruption of the continuous chant or recitation of the Psalms for other reading. Balsamon,[2] commenting on the 17th Canon of Laodicea, says that when it was found that the uninterrupted recitation or singing of so many Psalms became a source of fatigue and distraction to the laity who were in attendance, and who showed it by their manner or by leaving the church, these καθίσματα or breathing-spells were introduced. A certain number of Psalms was recited, and then followed the reading of a portion of Scripture, or the Fathers, or of some prayers, by the Anagnostes or some one else in the choir. After this the Psalms were resumed, to be followed again by an intermediate space filled up by reading or vocal prayer. The Nestorian Syrians have likewise in their Office *mautbe*, or sessions, which according to Assemani,[3] are identical with the καθίσματα of the Greeks.

But since in the Syrian Catholic Office the *kaume* or stations are found only in the Night Office, where the Psalms are comparatively few, it seems more reasonable to seek some other explanation of the name. Why should it not be looked on as a "standing up" in the moral sense, a presenting one's self before God to offer Him cheerful service and sing His praises? This would seem to be indicated by the words of a prayer recited just before the first *kaumo* in Monday's Office:

"Vouchsafe, oh Lord God! that in company of the (heavenly) Watchers who, watch and slumber not, of the Angels who give praise and cease not, we too this night may be watchful unto thy praise and ready to *stand* (*lit.* ready for the kaumo or station) before Thy glorious majesty."[4]

May we not regard it as identical in sense with the Latin word "station" (*statio*) used by the early Christians of the West to imply, amongst other things, watching and praying in church by

---

[1] De Libris Ecclesiast. Graecor. apud Fabricium Biblioth. Gr. Hamburgi, 1712; tom. v. in Append. p. 40.

[2] Apud Allatium, l. c.

[3] Bibl. Orient. tom. iii. pp. 71, 201.

[4] O. M. ed. 1863, p. 97, l. 13.

night?[1] Tertullian expressly says: "Station is a name we have borrowed from the language of the camp, for we are God's soldiers."[2] *Statio* implies properly a soldier's post, whence *stationem agere*, "to be on duty, to mount guard, etc." What word more suitable than this for the monk, priest, or devout layman, who, summoned from slumber, repairs to his post, to don the spiritual armor of watching, prayer, and psalmody, and to offer to God and his Holy Church that service which she expects from His soldiers. And this idea is favored by the O. S. or Antiochene Breviary, which in the Nocturns of Friday and Saturday uses the word, *Teshmeshto* (service) where *kaumo* is used on the other days of the week. The whole Night Office is identified with the night watch in the Syrian liturgy of the Nestorians.[3] For, in the Ritual for the consecration of the Patriarch elect, "keeping the night watch" is used as synonymous with "reciting the Nocturns." "Then beginning with the first Psalm of David," says the rubric, "they keep watch (*shohrin shahro*)," or in the literal version "they watch out their night watch." Assemani translates literally and adds in parenthesis the explanation: "et vigilant vigiliam (*hoc est*, dicunt nocturnum officium)." Besides this, the keynote to the true sense of the word *kaumo* seems to be clearly given in the second verse of the 133d Psalm, which begins the Night Office. "Praise the Lord, all ye servants of the Lord, ye who *stand* (*d'koimin*) by night in the house of the Lord."[4] This refers to the Levites who did night duty in the temple, whether actively engaged or awaiting with cheerful readiness whatever charge might

[1] Even in the Pagan language of Rome the idea of watching was connected with the *statio;* hence the "stationes et vigilias" of Livy (x. 32) and Tacitus (Ann. xiii. 35). The same expression found its way to the Eastern Church, and we find St. Gregory Nazienzen speaking of στάσεις πάννυχοι in Or. ad PP. Const. Apud Mansi Concilior. Coll. Florentiæ, 1759, Tom. iii. col. 553. As these vigils and prayers were mostly accompanied by fasting, this too acquired the name of *statio*, as we find in Tertullian, St. Ambrose, and many other Fathers. Yet there seems to have been a recognized distinction between *statio* and *jejunium*. The latter was a fast undertaken at the prompting of private devotion, while *statio* meant a fast imposed by the Church, the duty enjoined on His soldiers by the great Commander. "Castra nobis sunt nostra jejunia . . . stationes vocantur, quod stantes et commorantes in eis inimicos insidiantes repellamus." (St. Ambrose, Serm. xxv.). The season of Lent was looked upon as a great campaign, in which the chief stronghold was fasting and acts of mortification and self-restraint, the most trusty weapons for defence and offence. The old Christian view of Lent is beautifully expressed in the collect "*concede nobis Domine*," sung after the distribution of the Ashes on the first day of Lent. This collect is older than the days of St. Gregory the Great, for it is found in his Sacramentarium.

[2] "Statio de militari exemplo nomen accepit, nam et militia Dei sumus." Lib. de Oratione, cap. xiv.

[3] Assemani, Bib. Or. iv. 669.

[4] This is the correct reading, and is found in the Hebrew original, in the Syriac Version, and in St. Jerome's Bibliotheca Divina. The LXX and Vulgate have run the words "by night" into the following verse.

be assigned them.[1] That the meaning of "standing" (or station) is moral and spiritual, not material, is further shown from the formula "stomenkalos," which occurs frequently in the Syriac Breviary, not only at the Nocturns but likewise at Lauds and Vespers.[2] It is borrowed from the Greek liturgy and is made up of the two Greek words στῶμεν καλῶς, "let us stand up handsomely" or manfully; that is, "let us undertake and keep to our task as becomes true servants and soldiers of Christ."

The stations (or *kaume*) in the O. M. are four in number. The first has for heading "Of the Mother of God;" the second is entitled "Of the Martyrs;" the third "Of the Faithful Departed." But this on two days of the week is headed "Of the Priests," and contains prayers, etc., for the special welfare and spiritual profit of the clergy. The fourth has no heading, and consists principally of the song of the Three Children, followed by other canticles, prayers, and hymns. The night service in the O. S. has but three *kaume*; the first in honor of the Blessed Virgin (every day but Friday, when it is of the Cross); the second is sometimes in honor of the Saints in general, at others of the Apostles or Martyrs; the third is on some days devoted to the Faithful Departed, on others to Penance, consisting (as the name would suggest) of prayers and hymns expressing sorrow for sin, fear of God's judgments, and exhortations to repentance.

The chief features of the Lilio in the O. M. are, besides the four kaume or stations and numerous prayers and anthems, the 133d Psalm, *Ecce nunc benedicite*, the canticle of the Three Children (*Benedicite omnia opera*), the little *Laudate*, or Psalm cxvi. (Sundays excepted), and the pentasyllabic hymn of Balæus (Mar Balai), which begins "Oh Thou that hast mercy on sinners!" accompanied by another (which is varied every day) of the same author and in the same metre. In the O. S., besides the above-mentioned Psalms, four others are added, the 132d, *Ecce quam bonum*, and the three last of the Psalter (cxlviii.–cl.) The hymn of Balæus is sometimes the one beginning, "Oh Thou that hast mercy, etc.," as above, at others one which begins, "Oh Thou full of mercies, renew thy creation!" As to the time of reciting the Nocturns, the Eastern monks generally rise for that purpose at midnight, as do the Car-

---

[1] The verb *stare* here means "dienstbereit und diensthuend dastehen." Dr. Valentine Thalhofer, Erklaerung der Psalmen, Regensburg, 1871, p. 753.

[2] As for example, in the O. S. pp. 39, 60, 63, 139, etc. We do not think the word is to be met with in the O. M. It is found, not in its borrowed Greek form, but literally translated into Syriac *Nkum shaphir*, in the book of Severus already quoted. (De Ritibus Bapt. p. 35.) Boderianus was unacquainted with the formula, and translates incorrectly by "Exurgat omnium nostrum optimus" (Let him that is best amongst us stand up, etc.).

thusians, Camaldolese, Capuchins, and Franciscans (*strictioris observantiæ*) in the West. The Passionists, and possibly some other religious, rise two hours after midnight for the same Canonical Hour. In the Maronite Pontifical[1] at the ordination of a Deacon, the candidate (regular or secular) is warned that he must be assiduous in attending to the Divine Office morning, evening, and at midnight (*b'phelgeh d'lilio*). Assemani is witness that the same injunction is found in the Pontifical of the Syrian Jacobites.[2] Amongst the Nestorians the laity were formerly excused from attending at the Hours by day on account of their occupations, but not from Vespers or the Nocturns; but in later times they have been excused from the Nocturns or midnight office likewise. The clergy, however, are not exempted.[3] Whether and to what extent this strict discipline of early times has been relaxed in favor of the secular clergy among the orthodox Syrians, we have no means of ascertaining. In the Western Church, when primitive fervor had grown cold, the Nocturns, which had been recited separately, began to be recited continuously, and the time of saying them was gradually pushed forward from midnight to the hour of morning or Lauds.

IV. Ssaphro (lit. morning, Office of Daybreak). It corresponds exactly with what we call Lauds (properly *Laudes matutinæ*) in the Latin Church. It is recited only when the darkness of night is about to give way to the approaching day, and is therefore in the Syrian Church and in the whole East a Canonical Hour, essentially distinct from the *Lilio* or Nocturns. In the Western Church the two now form but one hour liturgically, and this is the chief ground on which some theologians of rigorous views maintain that it is unlawful to separate them. They forget, however, that it is by toleration, rather than by positive sanction of the Church, that the two hours have become one. With the decay of former strict discipline, the Nocturns were gradually shifted even *in choro* from midnight to daybreak, and thus it became unavoidable that they should be immediately followed by Lauds. The change has led to what is undoubtedly a misnomer, or *appellatio abusiva* as Radulphus calls it. And the rigorists might perhaps have made a better point had they insisted on the absurdity of reciting matins by themselves, since they are properly Nocturns or night service, and nothing but

---

[1] Assemani, Bibl. Or. tom ii. Dissert. de Monophys. § 10.

[2] Called generally Eutychians or Monophysites by Western writers, from Eutyches, founder of the heresy. But in the East they are better known as Jacobites, from James or Jacob Baradaeus, who died A. D. 578, and whose zeal in propagating Eutychianism was such that the heresy came at last to forget the master and glory in the name of the disciple.

[3] Cf. Assemani B. Or. iv. 338, 341.

their union with Lauds can at all justify their present appellation of matins. In the O. M. the principal parts of Ssaphro or Lauds are the Magnificat, the 62d Ps., *Deus, Deus meus*, the three last of the Psalter (Ps. cxlviii.–cl.), and besides prayers, anthems, and a *Sugito* (or canticle), the hymn of St. Ephrem, which begins

"O Thou that art risen, a Light for the just,
And a Joy for the upright of heart."

In the O. S. the same Psalms are found with the addition of the 113th, *Laudate pueri*, and the 50th, *Miserere*. This replaces the Magnificat, which in the O. S. is sung or recited at the *Lilio*, or Nocturns. On weekdays they have the *kaume* or stations, but never more than two. On Sunday the Hour ends by reading in Syriac (not Carshunic as at Vespers) a portion of the Gospel of St. John (xx. 1–18) taken from the Philoxenian version instead of the Peshito. On weekdays for this are substituted some portions of the 92d Ps., *Bonum est confiteri*, and of the 5th, *Verba mea*. It is worthy of notice that in certain Psalms the Lauds of the Syriac Church agree with the Roman Breviary, especially in the 62d, and the three last of the Psalter. The usage of these Psalms for morning service was naturally suggested by their context, and is very ancient in the Church. The 62d Psalm was called in the Greek Church, by way of distinction, the morning Psalm (ὁ Ψαλμὸς ὀρθρινός), and St. Athanasius enjoins the use of it at morning prayer.[1] In the same place he recommends the Canticle of the Three Children, of which the Fourth Council of Toledo (A.D. 1610) testifies that it was sung in the Catholic Church throughout the world. Cassian,[2] who died about two years after St. Augustine (433), speaks of the 148th, 149th, and 150th Psalms as forming part of Lauds.

V. VI. VII. The Third, Sixth, and Ninth Hour correspond exactly to our Tierce, Sext, and None. Sext is by the Syrians called indifferently the Sixth or the Midday Hour (*Phelgeh d'yaumo*). But where is their Prime? They have none, because there was no such Canonical Hour in the early Church. The Fathers of the first four centuries and the so-called Apostolical Constitutions speak of the other three Hours, but make no mention of Prime. We give a quotation or two from the early Fathers. Clement of Alexandria says: "Some have certain hours prescribed for prayer, as the Third, the Sixth, and the Ninth, but the perfect Christian (ὁ γνωστικὸς) prays all his lifetime."[3] Tertullian, though already out of the pale of the Church, is yet a competent witness. He calls the three just

[1] S. Athanas. De Virginitate, Opera. Paris, 1621, p. 1057.
[2] Apud Azevedo, op. cit. p. 118.
[3] Clementis Alexandrini, Opera, ed. Potter, Venetiis, 1757, p. 854.

mentioned "the Apostolic hours," that is, set apart for prayer by Apostolic example and tradition.

"Why should we not understand that these three hours, being of greater importance in human affairs, since they divide the life and occupations of men and are publicly sounded (viz., by crier or trumpet), should have come to be more solemn times of prayer to God? This is insinuated by the example of Daniel, who prayed thrice a day, setting apart certain hours, and these no other than the principal ones, which afterwards became Apostolic hours, namely, the Third, Sixth, and Ninth."[1]

St. Jerome more than once mentions these three hours exclusively. At the risk of adducing unnecessary evidence in proof of what cannot be denied, we give an extract from the works of the Saint, for the sake of a passage which occurs in it. Instructing a Christian matron of one of Rome's noble houses how to train up her daughter, he says:

"Let her learn by example (of the elderly maiden who has her in charge) to rise by night for prayer and psalmody; to sing hymns in the morning; to take her place in the ranks, like a soldier of Christ, at Tierce, Sext, and None; and, when her lamp is lighted, to offer the evening sacrifice. Thus let her day pass, thus let the night find her engaged."[2]

Some authors formerly maintained that Prime was a Canonical Hour before the days of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine; but this will not stand the test of historical criticism. Their opinion is based on the assumption that St. Ambrose added to Prime the Hymn *Jam lucis*, which is now recited at the beginning of the Hour, and that St. Augustine in his Rule speaks of Prime as a regularly established portion of the Office. In the first place, the authorship of the hymn is doubtful. There are many hymns in the Western Church which were not written by St. Ambrose, and yet are called *Ambrosian* hymns, because modelled after his style and metre. So too in the Syriac Church many a hymn, written neither by St. Ephrem nor St. James of Sarug, is current nevertheless under

---

1 "Cur non intelligamus . . . . TRES ISTAS HORAS, ut insigniores in rebus humanis, quæ diem distribuunt, quæ negotia distinguunt, quæ publice resonant, ita et solemniores fuisse in orationibus divinis? Quod etiam suadet Danielis quoque argumentum ter die orantis, utique per aliquarum horarum exceptionem, non aliarum autem quam insigniorum exinde Apostolicarum, Tertiæ, Sextæ et Nonæ." Tert. De Jejun, Inter Opp. ed. Rigalt. Lutetiæ, 1641, p. 708.

2 Assuescat exemplo (virginis veteranæ) ad orationes et psalmos nocte consurgere; mane hymnos canere; Tertia, Sexta, Nona hora *stare in acie quasi bellatricem* Christi, accensaque lucernula reddere sacrificium Vespertinum. Sic dies transeat, sic nox inveniat laborantem. Ep. cvii. ad Lætam inter Opp. Hieronymi, Ed. Vallarsi, Venetiis, 1766, tom. i. col. 689 (see also Ep. cxxx. ad Demetriadem, same volume, col. 991). Note the Saint's expression, *stare in acie*. It shows the prevailing Christian idea, that Psalmody was a part of the Christian's warfare, a standing at one's post like a soldier of Christ. And this helps to illustrate what was said before of the kaumo, station, or standing up, to watch and pray.

the name of *Ephremitic* and *Jacobitic* (*Aphremito*, *Yakobaito*), because written in imitation of the manner and measure of these two holy poets. But even granting that the *Jam lucis* could be positively traced to St. Ambrose as its author, might it not have been transferred to the Office subsequently, when Prime became a regular institution throughout the West? Thus Prudentius wrote several hymns for his own private devotion; but it was only long after his death that they were incorporated with the Divine Office. As to the "Regula S. Augustini" alluded to, every one knows that it is much later than the Saint, whose name it falsely bears. It was discarded three centuries ago by the Louvain editors of the Saint. How much less could we expect it to find favor at the hands of the Benedictine, Dom Coustant?[1] But leaving aside these unfounded assumptions, we have recorded the exact date and account of the first introduction of Prime. Cassian[2] tells us expressly that it commenced about the year 400 in his monastery at Bethlehem, in order to fill up the gap between Lauds and Tierce, that is, between daylight and 9 A.M.; or, as he plainly puts it, "ne monachi, qui post Laudes cubitum redibant, prolixius quam par esset somno indulgerent." It may have been Cassian himself who having come West when his friend and patron St. Chrysostom was persecuted by the imperial court of Byzantium, introduced Prime into some of the monasteries of Gaul, whence it gradually extended over Europe.

The newness of Prime as a Canonical Hour may be seen from its uncertain liturgical *status*, which lasted for some time. Cassian gives it no name, but calls it merely the "second morning Hour," Lauds being counted the first. In the days of St. Benedict, in the sixth century, it had come to be generally known as "Prime." But though St. Benedict treats it as a distinct Hour from Lauds, yet we find thirty years later in the same century St. Aurelian of Arles considering it as a part of Lauds, and enacting that it be sung *in choro* with Matins and Lauds.[3] So, too, its component parts varied with time and place. The 118th Psalm, *Beati immaculati*, was long peculiar to the Roman Church, and it is only in the seventh century that we find it coming into use amongst the churches and monasteries of the West. The number of Psalms likewise varied. In most places there were only three, in others six. St. Aurelian

[1] The Maurine edition of St. Augustine had for its chief editors FF. Delfau and Blampin, but the difficult, critical task of discriminating between the genuine and supposititious works of the Holy Doctor, and restoring the latter to their true authors, was intrusted to Coustant. See the Histoire Litteraire de la Congregation de Saint-Maur, Bruxelles (in all probability false date for Paris), 1770, p. 294, 418. A learned and useful book, but written with a strong bias in favor of the refractory sect of Appellants.

[2] De Institut. Cœnobit. lib. 3, cap. 4, apud Merati in Notes and Additions to Gavantus, op. cit tom. iii. p. 111.

[3] Martene de Antiq. Eccl. Ritibus, ed. cit. tom. iv. p. 16; Merati loc. cit.

of Arles, while allowing six for the nuns, prescribes twenty for the monks. Six was the standing number of the Roman Church, and that number is yet sacredly retained in the Roman Cathedral of St. John in Lateran. They were recited before the *Beati immaculati.* But in the reformation of the Breviary which was made about three hundred years ago, these six Psalms were distributed throughout the days of the week, and hence we discover why the Ferial Office of the seventh day (Saturday) has no Psalm between the *Deus in nomine Tuo* and the *Beati immaculati.*

This much has been said to explain why the Syriac and Eastern Breviaries have no Prime. In the Syriac Office the 118th Psalm is not recited entire at any Hour, but portions of it (especially the last seven verses beginning "*Intret*," etc., and those beginning with the 105th, "*Lucerna pedibus meis*," which we say at Sext) are repeated frequently at different hours during the week. Tierce, Sext, and None have no special Psalms, but are made up of prayers, anthems, and hymns. One of these prayers always, and generally at Tierce, is for all orders and conditions of men, especially for the poor and destitute, widows, orphans, prisoners, captives, etc. It resembles our prayers of Good Friday, or what is more briefly contained in the longer *Preces* of Lauds on Monday. In the O. M. the final Hymn at Tierce and None is taken from St. James of Sarug, except on Fridays, when it is from St. Ephrem. The contrary holds good of Sext, where throughout the week the concluding hymn is from St. Ephrem, except on Friday, and then it is from St. James. In the O. S. the hymns of Sext and None are exclusively from Balæus; those of Tierce from St. James, with the exception of the Sunday hymn, which is St. Ephrem's.

None is considered as the last Hour, and is followed by some prayers which end the office, and are called the *Hhutomo*[1] (literally the *closing* or *sealing*). In this God is besought to receive the service offered Him and to have mercy and spare through the intercession and prayer of the Blessed Virgin, the Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, Holy Priests, Doctors, and all Saints; also "through the prayers of Mar N. Pope of Rome, and of Mar N. Peter, our Patriarch."[2] Then follow other prayers for the Faithful

[1] O. M. ed. 1830, p 18 of Appendix. It seems also to be said after Complin, as it certainly is in the O. S., where the rubric gives it after Complin (O. S p. 33); and it would seem quite natural, one being the end of the liturgical, the other of the natural day. It is true that the rubric of the O. S. does not indicate it after None, but that proves nothing; as the rubrics are very negligently given in the whole book. Thus the Pater, Ave, Credo, and Trisagion are put down at the end of Sext, but omitted at Tierce and None.

[2] The Catholic Patriarchs in the East do not change their name at their accession, as is usual with the Roman Pontiff. They merely add to it a fixed name, which is the same for all. Thus the Patriarch of the Maronites takes always the name of Peter; the Patriarch of the Syrians that of Ignatius; the Patriarch of the Chaldees that of

departed, for the city or place in which the church is situated where the office has been said, for all of the laity who have been present and have spiritually shared in the service, for their deceased relatives, etc. Every Hour is begun and ended with the Pater, Ave, and Trisagion.[1] The *Credo*, as far as we can gather from the rubrics, which are not given in a way satisfactory to an outsider, is said at least at the principal hours. It is not the Apostle's Creed, as in our Breviary, but that of Nice (or Constantinople); and is recited in the plural number "We believe" (*Whaimnuan*), not "I believe" (Credo). The Angelic Hymn, "Gloria in excelsis," is also said at the beginning of the office among the preliminary prayers. No Hour is recited, no kaumo, even in the Nocturns, in which prayers are not offered up for the Faithful departed. Indeed, the frequent and tender remembrance of "those who have gone before us with the sign of Faith, and sleep the sleep of peace," is a touching characteristic of the Syriac Office, and shows how deep-rooted in their soul is the Catholic idea of the two worlds, the living and the dead, separated by the grave and yet one in the "communion of Saints." In praying for them they are uniformly styled "those who have eaten Thy body, O Lord, and drunk Thy blood, and slept in Thy hope." This last phrase, when literally translated, is yet more beautiful. It is strictly "who have laid them down *on* Thy hope (*Da'shcheb hal sabroch*)." As much as to say: "Though mouldering in the dust, they are not hopelessly gone, they are not dead, but softly sleeping, gently pillowed on the hope that springs from Thy promises." The promises, as the context shows, are those of Our Saviour in St. John's Gospel;[2] and the Syriac Liturgy

Joseph. The heretical Patriarchs do the same; the Jacobite incumbent of Antioch takes the name of Ignatius, which practice began in 1303, though there are cases of change of name in that See as early as 878, when the newly elected dignitary changed his name of Josue into Ignatius. The Nestorian Chaldees have two Patriarchs, one of whom always assumes at his consecration or installation the name of Simeon, the other that of Elias. The former resides at Urmia in Persia, where the American Presbyterians have a mission amongst that "interesting" people, who deny Our Lord and His Mother; the latter formerly at Bagdad but now near Mussul. See Faustus Naironus Euoplia Fidei Catholico-Romæ, 1694, pp 18, 19, 44, and Assemani, Bib. Orient, tom. ii. pp. 382, 457, and Dissert. de Monophysitis (in the same volume), p 42.

[1] These are the well-known words: "O Holy God! O Holy and Strong! O Holy and Immortal," etc., which occur in the Latin Breviary at the Ferial prayers of Prime, and are sung in Greek and Latin at the public office of Good Friday.

[2] "I am the Bread of Life. This is the Bread, descending down from Heaven, that if any one eat of it, he may not die. I am the Living Bread, which came down from Heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the Bread which I will give is MY FLESH for the life of the world . . . Amen, amen I say unto you: Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed . . . He that eateth me, the same also shall live by me . . . He that eateth this bread, shall live for ever." John vi. 48–59.

in this, as in a thousand other places, reveals unconsciously the lively faith of that Church in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which is for her a reality, not the empty, vague, unmeaning symbol, into which Western heresy strives to interpret it. She is not making a profession of faith in this doctrine, she is thinking and speaking of something else; yet out of the abundance of her heart the mouth speaketh, and without intending it she shows her belief in the Real Presence. So, too, in another place,[1] while praying with fervent charity that God may have mercy on the souls of deceased priests, she lovingly reminds Him of the priest's eyes that saw His glory on the altar, the ears that from day to day drank in the sweet anthems of the divine office, the mouths that sang His praise, the feet that daily trod His sanctuary, and finally the hands that LIFTED UP His Body and His Blood in the daily oblation.[2] The Catholic, in hearing this, naturally recalls the awful moment of the elevation, when the priest raises the Host and Chalice for the adoration of the prostrate crowd of believers. But what sense would these words have for men whose faith cannot rise above unconsecrated elements of mere bread and wine? According to the Syriac rite, incense is used at every hour, and even at every kaumo of the night service.

The entire Syriac Breviary may be said to consist of three parts: I. The *Shhimto*, or Ferial Office for Sundays and weekdays. II. The Special Office for Lent and Holy Week. III. The Offices of the Festivals of Our Lord and His Holy Mother, of the Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, etc. In this article only the Shhimto or first part has been considered. The first edition of it in Europe was in Rome under Innocent X. about the middle of the seventeenth century, and is only to be found in a few old libraries. A copy of it was used by Edmund Castell in the preparation of the Syriac portion of his *Polyglot Lexicon*, which appeared in 1669. The second edition was printed at Rome likewise, in 1787; we have never seen a copy, but find this date assigned by Wenig in his *Schola Syriaca* (p. 74), and by Zingerle in his *Chrestomathy* (p. 360). The third, which stands first at the head of this article, is that of 1830, and was used by Bernstein for his *Syriac Dictionary*, of which only a few pages[3]

[1] In the Vespers of Wednesday, O. M. ed. 1863, p. 222, l. 14.

[2] The same phrase, "lifting up," or "elevating Christ's Body on the Altar," is often repeated; as on p. 246, l. 5; 245, l. 13; where the Priest is said to lift up on the Altar the "Living Body of God" (*Phagro hhayo d' Aloho*). Again, on p. 247 (l. 3), St. James of Sarug sings in allusion to the priests "The hands of the priests, that have offered sacrifice for sinners, may they clap palm to palm (in token of joy) amidst the choirs of Thy praisers (the Angels). The fingers too, that have broken Thy Body and Blood, may they go forth to meet Thee, grasping branches of triumph," etc.

[3] (Berolini apud Duemmler, 1857.) Only 72 pages, or 144 columns, extending down to AIU, or about one-third of the first letter, Olaph. It is sad to think that Bernstein received

have been published, and also by R. Payne Smith for his *Thesaurus Syriacus*, now in course of printing at Oxford. Of the fourth edition we have no knowledge.[1] The fifth edition is the small one of 1863, printed in small type, of which Cardinal Wiseman used to say that it was the best and handsomest Syriac type in Europe. The third and fifth editions differ in this only, that the latter has the Burial Service in the end (partly Syriac, partly Karshunic), which is wanting in the other; but it lacks the Calendar of Saints, the Psalms given in full, and the prayers before and after the Office, all which are contained in the edition of 1830. Both, however, have Table of Movable Feasts, according to the Roman (or Gregorian) Calendar, which was introduced among the Maronites as early as 1606 by the Patriarch Joseph Risius.[2] We are not aware that the O. S. was printed before the edition of 1853. The Office of Holy Week was published apart by the Lutheran Clodius at Leipsic in 1720.

All the Breviaries current in the Syrian tongue have a general family resemblance; having not unfrequently the same prayers, hymns, anthems, and tunes, though they vary in arrangement and detail, and some of them unfortunately are tinged with heterodoxy. For, it must be borne in mind that the Syriac is the sacred language of six different communities in the East, who are divided by nationality, ritual worship, and even religious belief, and yet have a common tongue for the recitation of the Canonical Hours and the celebration of the Divine Mysteries. They are first the Maronites,

---

little or no encouragement, and would have had to suspend his work, even if death had not snatched him away after the publication of those few pages. Agrelli, Lorsbach, Arnoldi, Lindgrave, and Quatremere, all died, like Bernstein, with unfinished Syriac Dictionaries on their hands. All the materials of Bernstein and Quatremere have been purchased for the new work of Payne Smith, of which one Fasciculus (comprising the entire letter Olaph) has been published at Oxford (Clarendon Press, 1868. We hope the work will be brought to a successful issue, but if ten years or more are to run before the appearance of each letter of the alphabet, who is to enjoy the fruit of all this toil? Not the living scholar, but only, as the poet says:

Nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis.

[1] It may have been printed in the East, for there are in that region several printing offices for the dissemination of Catholic books amongst the Syrian and Chaldean Christians. The Melchites have one on Mt. Libanus, the Maronites at Aleppo, the Jesuits at Beirut, the Dominicans at Mussul, and the Franciscans at Jerusalem. They are mostly books of devotion in the vernacular (Arabic) for circulation among the people, but also some theological works meant only for the use of the clergy. (See Antiqua Eccl. Syro-Chaldaicæ Traditio, auctore Josepho David, Chorepiscopo Mossulensi. Romæ. 1870, p. 118.) Mgr. David repeats a complaint that we have ourselves heard years ago from very good authority, and it is, that sufficient care is not taken to select competent translators. Thus of the Moral Theology of St. Liguori, printed in Arabic at Jerusalem, by the Franciscan Fathers within the last twenty years, the same Prelate calls it "in *pessimum ac putidissimum* sermonem Arabicum conversa." Ibid.

[2] Assemani, Biblioth. Orient. i. 553.

who take their name indirectly from St. Maro, the holy Abbot and friend of St. John Chrysostom, in whose honor a famous church and monastery were erected at Kyros, on the banks of the Orontes, and whose monks after his death seem to have been the foremost champions of orthodoxy against the rising sects of Nestorius and Eutyches. But their name comes directly from St. John who lived in the same monastery three hundred years after (about A.D. 700), who either by way of distinction called himself John of St. Maro's from the name of the monastery, or was surnamed Maro by others, because by his life and actions, and above all by his orthodox zeal, he was for his troubled times what St. Maro had been in his day. He was a bishop, and by his zealous energy and assiduous preaching checked the progress of Monothelism and maintained the purity of the Catholic faith in a great portion of Syria. The necessities of the hour in a period of anarchy compelled him to add to his Episcopal duties those of a temporal chieftain, and he appointed generals and provided a band of willing warriors to protect his people against the incursions of the Saracens, and the factious assaults of the Melchites or Monothelite sectarians, who endeavored in the name of the Greek emperor (whence their name) to propagate their heresy by fire and sword. John and his people resisted both enemies; and the world, which cares little for right or wrong, in its cruel insolence stigmatized them by the name of Mardaites or *rebels*, as it usually does with those who fight for right and justice, especially if they fail in the struggle. But John and those he encouraged in the good fight did not fail. Their resistance was successful. It kept in check the Monothelite faction and repulsed the Saracens. The people whom he had saved from foreign and domestic foes and whose faith he had preserved, gratefully looked up to him as their father and protector, they pitched their tents permanently round his dwelling, became a nation apart, and adopted the name of their benefactor. His deeds, his merits, and their reward resemble in some way the line of conduct, and what it led to, of Rome's Pontiff, when he did not refuse the *role* of protector and saver of his people, whom in their urgent need he had to rescue from the wily toils of the heretical Byzantine court abroad and the daily inroads of semi-pagan barbarians at home. Such is the account the Maronites themselves[1] give of their name and origin as a distinct body. They glory in the fact that the Catholicity they

[1] See Faustus Nairon, Euoplia, pp. 58–79; Jos. Simon Assemani, Bibl. Orient. i. 496–520; and his nephew, Stephen Evodius Assemani, in the Acta Martyrum Oriental. et Occidental., etc., Romæ, 1748, tom. ii. 405–412. Stephanus Edenensis, another Maronite, wrote a History of the Maronites in Arabic, which was translated into Latin by the Syrian Jesuit, F. Benedictus (Amberachi), but neither seems to have been ever published. Assem. B. O. i. 504.

have inherited has come down through the line of ages pure and unstained, and not a few Popes have publicly glorified the Maronite Church as the very flower of Eastern orthodoxy, the lily among thorns, the faithful handmaid of Catholic truth, uncorrupted by contact with the sects that surrounded her on every side. It would seem rash to dispute such praise, and coming from so elevated a source. Nevertheless, the claims of the Maronites to unchanging orthodoxy have been and are yet warmly contested by Eastern jealousy and by European criticism. Mgr. David of the Syriac (United) Church may be taken as a representative of the former element, or at least as an exponent of its views. In a book[1] written to prove the high esteem in which the Syrian Church has ever held the chair of St. Peter and its teachings, he takes pains to go out of his way and prove at some length that the Maronites were for a long time enveloped in the darkness of heresy, and in particular of Monothelism. Renaudot[2] enters the lists as spitefully as if he had a personal quarrel with the Maronite body, and boldly asserts that John Maro was no saint at all, but an arch-heretic.[3] Neither our space nor the scope of this article will permit us to argue the question. But we think the acquiescence of the Holy See in the Maronite tradition has (to say the least) imparted to it a strong support of *primâ facie* evidence, and that noble Catholic people may well be left in undisturbed possession of the inheritance of unwavering orthodoxy, on which they have prided themselves since they became known to the Western world. The Maronites dwell chiefly on the slopes of Mt. Libanus and the surrounding region, in Tripoli, Beirut, and other towns of the coast; they have colonies also in Aleppo, Damascus, etc., and even in the island of Cyprus. Their Patriarch, who always takes his title from the See of Antioch, resides in the monastery of Canubin on Libanus, and has under him five Archbishops and eight or ten Bishops.[4]

Secondly, the Syrians of the Antiochene Rite, who prefer the simple appellation of Syrian (or United Syrian) Christians. They are not many in number, and were converted about two hundred years ago from Eutychianism. Their Patriarch takes his title from Antioch, but resides in Aleppo. It is in this city, in Damascus, Mussul, and Diarbekir (the ancient Amida), that the United

[1] In the work already quoted, Antiqua Eccl. Syro-Chaldaicæ Traditio, p. 95–110.

[2] Liturgiar. Oriental. Collectio, Parisiis, 1716, tom. ii. pp. 7, 15, 16, and elsewhere.

[3] Renaudot was a good and learned man, but the tone, haughty and flippant, in which he talks of the ignorance, negligence, etc., of the Roman Censors of Oriental books, and especially of those who permitted the Rom. ed. of the Antiochene Missal, is intolerable. Stephen Evod. Assemani (l. cit. p. 405) promised to publish a dissertation in defence of that edition of the Missal, but we have never seen it.

[4] Faustus Nairon, Euoplia, p. 94.

Syrians are to be found. The book we have designated throughout by the initials O. S. is their Ferial Office. Besides the edition of their Missal, censured by Renaudot (spoken of in a preceding note), another has been printed at Rome in 1843.

Thirdly, the Chaldeans or United Chaldeans. Their conversion from Nestorianism to Catholic unity dates from only a little over three centuries. The first in the series of Catholic patriarchs was Simeon VIII.[1] The language of their Scripture and Liturgy is Syriac, though they prefer to call it by the name of Chaldee. Between it and the Syriac there is absolutely no difference, no dialectic variation, except in the written character and the pronunciation.[2] The United Chaldees reside mostly in Mesopotamia and Persia, especially in Bagdad, Mussul, and around the lake of Urmia. To these Chaldees should be added the Christians of Malabar, known as the "Christians of St. Thomas," who also use the Chaldee or Syriac language in the Divine Offices.[3] The Chaldee Missal "juxta ritum Ecclesiæ Chaldæo-Malabaricæ," was printed at Rome in 1845. The Chaldee Breviary (2d edition) was printed in Rome also, in 1865.

These three Syriac Rites belong to orthodox Christians, that is, Catholics in communion with the Holy See. The other two are of the Syrians who profess Eutychianism, or Jacobites, and of the Chaldees, who are Nestorians. Both have Syriac for their sacred language; and it may be assumed as a rule, that their breviaries are substantially the same as those of the Catholic Syrians and Chaldees, and differ only in the heretical interpolations or additions which have been expunged from the latter.

The antiquity of the Shhimto, or Ferial Office, is incontestable. Faustus Nairon[4] confidently refers its origin to the Apostles or their immediate successors. And this is substantially true. For, as

---

[1] See the list of Catholic Chaldee Patriarchs in the "Series Patriarcharum Chaldæorum," in the appendix to Guriel's "Elementa Linguæ Chaldaicæ," Romæ, p. 193. His name was originally John Sulaka. His life and glorious martyrdom are given in detail by Assemani, Bib. Or. i. p. 523–534.

[2] Most Syriac books printed outside of Rome give the title-page in the Chaldee character, though the body of the book be in Syriac type The difference of pronunciation consists in doubling the consonant wherever a dagesh would be found in Hebrew, as Syr. *capho* (palm of the hand), Chaldee *cappa* They also pronounce the vowel *o* (skopho) like *a*. Thus Syr. moronoyo (lordly), Chald. maranaya. Finally, they soften *b* and *ph* after a vowel into our *w*, as *napsho* (soul), Chald. *nawsho*, where *naw* is pronounced like our word *now*.

[3] They were converted from Nestorianism by the Portuguese after they had made settlements in India. But some remained obdurate. A great deal of valuable information about the Church of Malabar and its restitution to Catholic unity may be read in the work, not easily found, of the Augustinian John Facundus Raulin, "Historia Ecclesiæ Malabaricæ cum Diamperitana Synodo," etc. Romæ, 1745, 4.

[4] Euoplia, p. 106.

the obligation of Psalmody and prayer at fixed hours dates from the very beginning of the Church, it could scarcely have been enforced, unless the prayers as to number and form of words had been regulated by Church authority. Hence it is only natural that the groundwork of the present Office must have been framed in Apostolic times. And that this does not differ materially from what is used at this day will be very clear to whoever reflects that the Church, conservative by nature everywhere, is doubly so among the peoples of the East. The Office received gradual accessions, until it was closed to all further additions, according to Nairon, about the middle of the fifth century, or after the Council of Chalcedon. Nairon argues from the fact, that no heretics are mentioned in the Office later than Arius and Nestorius;[1] and further that in the "Offices of the Saints" no saints after that epoch have a special Office assigned them. This is true and confirms the substance of what he says. But this does not exclude the probability that some additions may have been made from time to time. The many references to "the cruel yoke of the unbeliever" under which they lived have always appeared to us applicable, not to the sway of the idolatrous Roman, as Nairon thinks, but to later times. And indeed the repeated allusions not only to the profane (or unbelieving) people, but to the torrent of evils that drew from the Church tears and groans, to the sword and captivity, to famine and bondage, to "the barbarous nations who scoff at God's name and threaten His elect everywhere,"[2] point clearly to the despotic rule of the Saracen, and the predatory incursions of Tartars, Arabs, etc. The fear in which they perpetually lived of domestic oppression and foreign invasion, with its consequent horrors of abduction and captivity, is shown not only by direct appeals to Heaven for protection, but also by indirect allusions which betray the underlying habitual current of thought. Thus, for example, the Cross is invoked as the Christian's best refuge and shelter from the Devil and his hosts, and amongst other evils "from the violent hand and the strange foot,"[3] which is their

[1] Ibid. He quotes the Vespers of Sunday, but in the editions of 1830 and 1863, no such passage is found. Indeed from various quotations made by him and by other authors, and which do not appear in the modern editions, we have come to the conclusion that not a few passages have been omitted which were to be found in the earliest Roman editions. Nestorius, however, is mentioned in the O. S. p. 121, at the Nocturns of Monday, where he is called "the" accursed Nestorius (*Nestur hito*), and is said to be in hell. This may sound very uncharitably in some ears, but who can blame the simple-hearted Christians of Syria for applying to the individual case of a notorious blasphemer, what Christ our Lord promulgated as a divine decree for all? "He that believeth not, shall be damned" (Mark xvi. 16, Protestant Version).

[2] O. M. ed. 1863, pp. 26, 77, 148, 297, 427, 476, 494, O. S. pp. 263, 500.

[3] In note O. S. p. 34.

poetical way for expressing highhanded tyranny at home and invasion from abroad.

Another point, which seems to indicate that the *Shhimto* has undergone a change, is the diminished number of Psalms to be recited. It must certainly once have contained many more, as do yet the other Eastern Breviaries. And this seems to be confirmed by their laws and usages. In the Syriac Church we find, as early as 341, that the Bishop and Martyr St. Simon Barsaboe commanded his clergy to sing the Psalms at the Divine Office not from a book but from memory.[1] Jos. Simon Assemani says that the Syrian clergy when travelling use a book called Beth-Gazo (the Treasure) for the prayers, anthems, etc., but generally speaking recite the Psalms from memory.[2] The same practice prevailed in the early Western Church. St. Jerome's injunction for Clerics was "Discatur Psalterium ad verbum" (Ep. ad Rusticum). The Eighth Council of Toledo decrees that no one shall be promoted to any grade among the clergy who does not know the entire Psalter.[3] The Second General Council of Nice enacts that no one shall be raised to the Episcopal dignity unless he know well the Psalter; for he is to see that it be taught to his clergy. St. Gregory the Great relates of himself that he had not ventured to ordain a certain John, because he found him ignorant of the Psalter.[4]

The Syrians do not recite the verses of the Psalms continuously or uninterruptedly, as we do in the Roman Breviary. But they add anthems at the end of every other verse. These anthems vary in length and in character. In them will be found anything that may come under the head of vocal or even mental prayer. Sometimes they are moral reflections, sometimes acts of contrition, of humility, or of hope. At times they are outbursts of admiration and rapture; again they are apostrophes addressed to the Blessed Virgin, the Saints, and Martyrs. Occasionally they are highly poetic and even dramatic in form, the poet or writer questioning the Mother of God, King David, the Martyrs, and adding their replies. To give the reader some idea of their practice of intermingling the verses of the Psalms with prayers and ejaculations, we append the 90th Psalm, *Qui habitat*, with its prayers from the Complin of Thursday.[5]

---

[1] *Men lebo.* "By heart," our own English phrase. Vid. Stephen Evodius Assemani, Acta Martyrum, i. 4. The editor adds that this is the custom of all the Oriental Churches.

[2] Biblioth. Orient. ii. 127.

[3] Qui non totum Psalterium noverit. The same is enacted of the Hymns and Canticles in use (canticorum usualium et hymnorum supplementum). See Summa Conciliorum Hispaniæ, Opera et Studio, P. M. F. Mathiæ de Villaluño. Matriti, 1784, tom. i. p. 542.

[4] Sed nec Joannem Presbyterum Psalmorum nescium præsumpsimus ordinare, lib. iv., Ep. 45.

[5] O. M. ed. 1863, p. 300

"V. 1. *Ioteb.* He who dwelleth, etc.

Woe is me, for evening hath come and I have done no work in the vineyard of righteousness, wherein the just are toiling. He called me at the third hour and I heard Him not; at the sixth and at the ninth, and I despised His commandments. O God! who at the eleventh hour didst call the thief, hear the sinners who call upon Thee and knock at Thy gate!

V. 2. *Emar.*[1] He saith to the Lord, etc.

At eventide I sign my limbs with Thy cross; I make it my keeper by day and by night. And at midnight whilst I slumber and sleep[2] the Evil One cometh, but seeing the Cross fleeth from it and hideth himself in the place full of darkness. And in the morning I rise and sing praise to Thee, O Lord!

V. 3. *B'ebrauhi.* With His pinions,[3] etc.

When the heavens and the earth shall be dissolved,[4] and the just shall fly through the clouds to meet the Son, their Lord, oh! join me to the crowd of Prophets, to the ranks of the Apostles and Martyrs, and I shall go forth with gladness to meet Thee in the day of Thy revelation; and sing praise to Thee on Thy right hand.

V. 7. *Nephlun.* There shall fall a thousand, etc.

O Lord, my God! since I have confessed Thee, deny me not on that dreadful day, when all men shall need forgiveness. Say not to me, 'I know thee not;' but in that hour when Thou shalt judge me, have mercy on me, O God! according to Thy goodness, and place me at Thy right hand with the just who have loved Thee.

V. 9. *Metul d'ant hu.* Because Thou art, etc.

O Judge of the living and the dead! have mercy on me then, when Thou shalt judge all generations. Let Thy goodness spread its wings over me, and let Thy justice deal mercifully with me. Let

---

[1] In the Pshitto it is not the future but the Preterite or Aorist.

[2] A purely Scriptural expression. See Ps. cxx. 4; Prov. vi. 10, xxiv. 33; Isaiah v. 27, and Our Lord's Parable, Matt. xxv. 5.

[3] The Vulgate and Douay have "shoulders." The Anglican Version "feathers."

[4] *Meshtario*, from *shro*, to *loosen*. "To dissolve" and "to destroy" are synonymous in Syriac. Hence when they wish to express the indestructibility of God's Church, whether militant on earth or triumphant in heaven, their ordinary phrase is the "indissoluble kingdom" (*malcuto d'lo meshtario*). And this is philosophically correct. For "destruction," in human speech, can mean nothing more than the resolution of matter into its indestructible elements. In the *Dies Iræ* we read "*solvens* sæculum" in this sense; and Milton makes the same use of the word:

> "Thy Saviour and Thy Lord
> Last, in the clouds from Heaven to be revealed
> In glory of the Father, to *dissolve*
> Satan with his perverted world."—Paradise Lost, xii. 543–5.

And in the same book (459):

> "When this world's dissolution shall be ripe."

thy great clemency enter with me into the house of judgment, that I may receive forgiveness and cry out: To Thee, O Lord! be glory.

V. 11. *Metul dal' malacauthi.* Because to His Angels, etc.

That I have sinned, O Lord! I confess and deny not. But I have heard likewise that Thy gate is open to those who repent, and I have taken courage. Spare me, O Lord! as Thou didst spare the thief, and forgive my debts as Thou didst with the sinful woman.[1] And as Simon Peter called on Thee, and Thou didst hear him, hear the sinners who call upon Thee and knock at Thy gate.

V. 14. *Metul d'li bho.* Because he hath sought[2] me, etc.

Whenever we commemorate the Blessed One,[3] the Angels and the children of men are filled with joy; the bones of the just rejoice in their graves because of the praise that is given her throughout the world. And whosoever honors her memory, God will bless his labor, and mercy will be poured out upon him.

Shubhho. Glory be to the Father, etc.

When the martyrs were judged, kings were put to shame and judges were condemned, but the servants of God were made illustrious, they grew and increased in glory. The Evil One howled, as he saw those champions valiantly coming out of the contest. He clothed himself with grief, and all his host fled away and vanished; but the Martyrs rejoiced in their crowns. May their prayer be a help to us!"

We subjoin another example, that the reader may more fully understand the character of these anthems, with which the Syrian Church interweaves her recitation of the Psalms. Those we are about to give are shorter, and resemble the anthems and responses of the Latin office more than those above quoted. They are used in the Morning Song of Saturday in note O. M., ed. 1863, p. 401, while reciting Psalms cxlviii., cxlix., cl., which in the Syriac Breviary as well as in our own, are considered liturgically as one, not being divided from each other by the *Gloria Patria*, or otherwise.

"Ps. cxlviii., v. 1. *Shabbahh(u) l'morio.* Praise ye the Lord, etc.

Gifts of praise and censers laden with reconciliation[4] Thy Church offers to Thee, O Lord! Out of that mercy that sent Thee down to our race, receive them, and forgive us all wherein we have sinned.

V. 4. *Shabhhuhi shmai shmajo.* Praise Him, ye heaven of heavens, etc.

---

[1] Who fell at Christ's feet in the house of the Pharisee. Luke vii. 37, 42.

[2] The Vulgate and Douay have "hoped in me." The Anglican Version has "set His love." The Hebrew means "to cling."

[3] The Blessed Virgin Mary.

[4] Tarhuto (h for Ain) would be most correctly rendered by the old word "appeasement" (placatio).

The King's Daughter (the Church) is established and standeth firm in faith, and in great honor and glory; and lo! by night and by day she sings glory to God who has established and set her up.

V. 7. *Shabahh(u) l'morio men arho.* Praise the Lord from the earth, etc.

O Son of the King! I have toiled in thy vineyard; I have taken upon me Thy yoke, and have borne it until now. Since I have not denied Thee before the children of men, deny me not before Thy Father.

V. 9. *Ture w'col romoto.* Mountains and all hills, etc.

Have mercy and save me and forgive me the sins I have committed, for the love of the Father, who begot Thee, and let me not be an outcast from the kingdom prepared for those who do the truth.[1]

V. 11. *Malche d'arho.* Kings of the earth, etc.

When thou shalt try men by fire, let me not be as stubble before Thee; but may I be delivered from Hell, and like gold be found pleasing in Thy sight.

V. 13. *Metul d'rab-hu.* For His name is great, etc.

I have eaten Thy body, I have found mercy in Thy living blood, and taken refuge in Thy Cross. Be appeased through these, O God! and deal mercifully with the sinners who call upon Thee.

Ps. cxlix., v. 1. *Teshbuhhto hhdato.* A new canticle, etc.

Lo! the churches and monasteries are singing praise to Thy glory, O Christ our King! they offer up to Thee their song, because Thou hast redeemed them from the bondage of sin.

V. 3. *Nshabhhun lashmeh.* Let them praise His name, etc.

O Redeemer! on Thy great day when Thou shalt come and Thy Angels with Thee, make us all worthy to cry out with joy at thy right hand, O King, who hast redeemed us by Thy Cross!

V. 5. *Nethshanun zadike.* The just shall be strengthened,[2] etc.

Make the light of Thy commandments shine forth in the hearts of Thy adorers; and let not the darkness of sin overtake us, and cover us with its gloom.

V. 5. *L'metbah purhono.* To exact retribution, etc.

O Thou who openest Thy gate to such as repent and come to

---

[1] *Facere veritatem* is a Syriasm, meaning to live and act conformably to that truth in which we profess to believe. In the New Testament it occurs John iii. 21; Ephes. iv. 15; I John i. 6. The Old Douay has retained this Semitic idiom in all three passages. Dr. Challoner, in two of the places quoted, has left our version undisturbed, but in the third (Eph. iv. 15), he follows Dr. Witham (1733) and translates it "performing the truth," as if "to perform" were clearer or more English than "to do" the truth. The Anglican version, has "to do the truth" in two of the texts, viz., John iii. 21, and I John i. 6.

[2] The versions generally have "shall rejoice." Ethashan (h for Ḥ) may also mean "to be elated, to glory," and so it is rendered in the Arabic Version.

Thee, open to me the gate of Thy mercies, that I may enter and from Thy treasury obtain pardon with the thief who believed in Thee!

Ps. cl., v. 1. *Shabahh(u) l'morio b'kudsheh.* Praise the Lord in His holy place, etc.[1]

'Holy, Holy, Holy art Thou, O Lord of Sabaoth,'[2] cry out the Watchers (Angels) above; 'Blessed be the glory of the Lord from the place of His Hiddenness,'[3] cries out the Church with her children.

V. 4. *Shabhhuhi baphlaghe.* Praise Him with timbrels, etc.

The dread Cherubim and Seraphim without number were seen by Isaiah in the sanctuary, while they were singing thrice: Holy, Holy, Holy, O Lord All-Powerful!

V. 5. *Shabbuhi b'kolo wab'khoto.* Praise him with the voice and shouting,[4] etc.

Hail! O Virgin pure and holy, Mary Mother of God! Intercede and seek mercy for the Church and her children, who honor the day of Thy commemoration.

Shubhho. Glory be to the Father, etc.

O ye chosen Prophets, Apostles of the Only-begotten, martyrs persecuted and slain! in union with us beseech Christ, whom ye loved, that He may deal mercifully with us all."

---

[1] It may also be translated "His Holiness."

[2] *Sbauth* or *Sbawuth.* Out of reverence for the words spoken in Heaven and first heard by Isaiah in his vision (Is. vi. 3), the Syrian Church, like the Latin, retains this term in her liturgy. It is retained also in the New Testament (Rom. ix. 29, and James v. 4) in the Catholic and Anglican versions, and even by Luther, who writes it incorrectly, after the fashion of his time, Zebaoth. Indeed, the absurd notion, that the Hebrew letter Ssade is identical with TS or TZ, has not yet been dispelled from the minds of many Hebrew scholars both Catholic and Protestant.

[3] Though this word is rarely met with and is now perhaps obsolete, yet it seems to be the only one in English that can suitably render the original term (*Gnizutoch*). The Syriac Office, when not made up solely of portions of the Scripture, is always full of Scriptural phrases and allusions. One of these, and a favorite one, refers to Isaiah xlv. 15: "Verily Thou art a HIDDEN God." From this passage the Syrian Church has derived a standing name or appellation of the Deity. It may be called one of His attributes, for it is only another form of expression for Invisible and Incomprehensible. Hence on almost every page of their Office we find Him called the "*Gnizo*" or "Hidden One." The abstract of this is *Gnizuto*, the condition or state of being hidden. And if we are to express this otherwise than by paraphrasis, it would be hard to fall back on any better English representative term than "Hiddenness."

[4] This differs somewhat from the Vulgate and English versions, which have only "cymbals of joy" or "highsounding cymbals." The Syriac might also be translated "with sound and noise."

CATHOLIC POETRY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

THERE was very little English poetry prior to the beginning of the sixteenth century; it should not be surprising if still less of the poetry of the English language since then be found to have derived its inspiration from the Catholic faith. For, from the execution of Robert Southwell in 1595, until within a very recent period, when English hearts could not resist a Faber, a Procter, and a De Vere, the government of England was loath to let Catholics live, much less to let them write poetry. It did not, indeed, for more than two hundred years, give them the right of life absolutely. The faith itself was almost extinguished in England; it survived English laws in Ireland, and when priest was forbidden to pray and bard to sing in their native tongue,—

> "The language of old Erin, of her history and name,
> Of her monarchs and her heroes,—her glory and her fame,
> The sacred shrine where rested, through sunshine and through gloom,
> The spirit of her martyrs, as their bodies in the tomb,
> The time-wrought shell, where murmured, 'mid centuries of wrong,
> The secret voice of Freedom, in annal and in song,"—

even while the "old tongue" passed away in Ireland, and the old faith passed away in England, Ireland, which had sent missionaries and scholars to convert and civilize England, Ireland, which had sent priests to build English altars and learned men to found English schools, Ireland, which never did England anything but good and has never received from her anything but evil,—Ireland welcomed the exiled muse of English Catholic poetry, nursed and cherished her, and gave her a home; and in the alien language, forced, at the sword's point, upon the victim nation, the poetry of the Church bloomed sweetly in the modest retirement of the Irish valleys. From Chaucer to Lydgate, from Lydgate to Southwell, there is no English poet whose verses illume the heaped dust of centuries. We have no right to look for another Catholic poet for two hundred and fifty years; yet we are compelled to claim Ben Jonson's purest work, and the best of Crashaw's, and Sir William Davenant's; while Dryden, Pope, Wycherly, and Tom Moore, if not as devout as Frederick William Faber, were Catholic in their religious sentiments, or nothing. If "Barry Cornwall" and Sir Aubrey de Vere are to be classified outside the Church, the daughter of the one and the son of the other have made ample amends for their fathers' misfortune. In addition to these we will find

many Catholic poets less known, in England, in Ireland, and in the United States.

That there was an abundance of lyrical poetry of piety prior to Chaucer, is extremely probable; but as Chaucer's English is all but unintelligible, the poets who preceded him in ruder times must lie wholly forgotten except when some poet-archæologist, searching for historical material in piles of half-ashen manuscripts, picks up by chance some early metrical testament of Anglo-Saxon faith, and translates it into contemporaneous diction. Thus the accomplished author of *Songs in the Night* found in the Egerton MSS. of the British Museum a hymn characteristic of the thirteenth century, when the language of the Church was so freely mingled with that of the people.

Maris Stella.

"Mary! beautiful and bright,
Velut Maris Stella,
Brighter than the morning light,
Parens et Puella;
I cry to thee, look down on me,
Ladye! Pray thy Son for me,
Tam pia,
That thy child may come to thee,
Maria!

"Sad the earth was, and forlorn,
Eva Peccatrice,
Until Christ our Lord was born,
De te Genetrice!
Gabriel's *ave* chased away
Darksome night, and brought the day,
Salutis;
Thou the fount whence waters play,
Virtutis.

"Ladye! flower of living thing,
Rosa sine spina!
Mother of Jesus, heaven's King,
Gratia Divina;
'Tis thou in all dost bear the prize,
Ladye! Queen of paradise,
Electa,
Maiden meek and mother wise,
Effecta.

"In care thou counsellest the best,
Felix fecundata;
To the weary thou art rest,
Mater honorata.
Plead in thy love to Him who gave
His precious blood the world to save,
In Cruce,
That we our time with Him may have
In Luce.

"Well knows He that He is thy Son,
Ventre quem portasti!
All thou dost ask Him then is won,
Partum quem lactasti!
So pitiful He is and kind,
By Him the road to bliss we find,
Superni;
He doth the gates of darkness bind,
Inferni."[1]

As to the fervor, the sincerity, or the consistency of Chaucer's faith we know very little, and no ground appears to exist for expecting to know more. Perhaps he was Catholic, because at his time poets were nothing else. The little authentic information we possess concerning his life and character does not warrant the assertion that had access to the throne and office under the government depended upon abjuration he would not have proved as obsequious as Spenser, as weak as Ben Jonson. He died in 1400, and English literature is almost blank in prose and poetry until Lydgate, Surrey, and Wyatt appear, nearly a century afterwards, during which period all reliable record of Chaucer's life disappeared, if, indeed, it was ever fully or truly written. It is generally held that he was born in London, that he studied at Cambridge or Oxford, possibly at both, and that at one time he contemplated making the law his profession. His raillery at the monks was not confined to verse, for he assaulted a Franciscan friar in Fleet Street, and paid a fine of two shillings for his muscular victory. Chaucer claims to have served his king and country during the French invasion by Edward III., and to have been made prisoner. He married, after his release, the daughter of Sir Payne Roet, another of whose daughters, Katherine, became wife to John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster. Thus brought into social relations with persons of influence, the poet sought, or at least accepted, political favors, and in 1372 went as one of an embassy to Genoa, where he may have met Petrarch. On his return to England the king conferred upon him a pitcher of wine daily, and appointed him comptroller of the customs from wools, with the condition that he should write out with his own hand the accounts of his office. Chaucer appears to have held this position, and another lucrative one, for fourteen years, at the end of which he was dismissed in consequence of an investigation into alleged abuses for which he was deemed accountable. During the term of his office he was sent abroad several times on government business. He died, probably, in extreme poverty, at the age of seventy-four, and was the first English poet buried in Westminster Abbey.

[1] The original may be seen on p. 194 of An Old English Miscellany, containing A Bestiary, Kentish Sermon, etc. London, Trübner.

Nothing is known with certainty concerning the order, the motives, or the purposes of his various poems. Their artistic excellence, wonderful considering the age in which they were produced, is almost lost upon the average reader of to-day, who can appreciate them only through the medium of a glossary. The scope of this article will admit of only one or two illustrations of Chaucer's style; and the first will serve as something more than an example of the English of the fourteenth century,—"English undefyled," as Spenser calls it. It is taken from the prologue to the *Canterbury Tales:*

"There was also a Nonne, a Prioresse,
That of hire smiling was ful simple and coy;
Hire gretest othe n'as but by Seint Eloy;
And she was cleped Madame Eglantine.
Ful wel she sange the service divine,
Entroned in hire nose full swetely;
And Frenche she spake ful fayre and fetisly,
After the scole of Stratford atte bowe,[1]
For Frenche of Paris was to her unknowne.
At mete was she wel ybaught withalle;
She lette no morsel from hire lippes falle,
Ne wette hire fingres in hire sauce depe.
Nel coude she carie a morsel, and wel kepe,
Thatte no drope ne fell upon hire breast.
In curtesie nas sette ful moche hire lest.
Hire over lippe wiped she so clene,
That in hire cuppe nas no farthing sene,
Of grese, whan she dronken hadde hire draught.
Ful semely after hire mete raught,
And silkerly she was of grete disport,
And ful pleasant, and amiable of port,
And freined hire to contrefeten chere
Of court, and ben estatelich of manere,
And to ben holden digne of reverence.
But for to spoken of hire conscience,
She was so charitable and so pitous,
She wolde wepe if that she saw a mous
Caught in a trappe, if it were ded or bledde.
Of smale houndes hadde she, that she fedde
With rosted flesh, and milk, and wastel brede.
But sore wept she if one of hem were dede,
Or if men smote it with a yerde smert:
And all was conscience and tendre herte.
Ful semely her wimple ypinched was;
Hire nose tretis; hire eyen grey as glas;
Hire mouth ful smale, and thereto soft and red;
But silkerly she hadde a fayre forehed,

[1] Sir Harris Nicholas, notes, p. 142, observes: "It may, however, be doubted whether Chaucer did not mean that she could not speak French at all; for it seems that, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the expression, 'French of Stratford at Bow,' was a colloquial paraphrase for *English*."—*The Canterbury Tales. Tyrwhitt's Notes and Glossary. Addenda*, p. 586.

It was almost a spanne brode I trowe;
For hardily was not undergwire.
Ful fetise was hire cloke, as I was ware.
Of small corall about hire arm she bare
A pair of bedes, garded all with greene;
And thereon heng a broche of gold ful shene,
On whiche was first ywritten a crowned A,
And after, *Anon Vincit Omniæ.*"

He describes the monk, who loved hunting:

"A manly man, to ben an abbot able."

And the "Frere," who was so capital a beggar, and the Marchant in motley, with a forked berd; and the Clerk:

"A clerk ther was of Oxenforde also,
That unto logike hadde long ygo,
As lene was his hors as is a rake,
And he was not right fat, I undertake;
But looked holwe, and thereto soberly,
Ful thredbare was his overest counteply,
For he hadde geten him yet no benefice.
Ne was nought worldly to have an office."

In which he differed from the poet, who was as inveterate an office-holder as the typical American partisan of our own time

"For him was lever han at his beedes hed
A twenty bokes, clothed in black or red,
Of Aristotle, and his philosophie,
Than robes riche, a fidel, in santrie,
But all be that he was a philosophre,
Yet hadde he but litel gold in cofre,
But all that he might of his frendes hente,
On bokes and on lerning he it spente,
And besily gan for the soules praie
Of hem, that gave him wherewith to scolaie.
Of studie boke he moste cure and hede,
Not a word spake he more than was nede;
And that was said in forme and reverence,
And short and quicke, and ful of high sentence.
Souning in moral venture was his speche,
And gladly wolde he lerne, and gladly teche."

The modernizing of Lydgate's *Court of Sapience*, by the author of *Songs in the Night*, has revived interest in that pious but almost forgotten poet, of whom little more is known beyond what his rescuer from oblivion gives in a prefatory sketch.

The *Court of Sapience* was written during the reign of Henry V., and apparently at the command of that monarch. The first book is composed of a debate between Mercy and Truth, Peace and Justice. In the second book is given a survey of the palace and do-

mains of Sapience, of natural productions, and of sciences and arts. Among these the monk of Bury substitutes *faith* for *logic*.

He appeals to Reason to teach him "the way to Sapience," and fell asleep, and in his dream is conducted to "a fair green meadow, around whose borders sparkling waters played," and there he found Sapience, Science, and Intelligence. Sapience speaks:

"Of all the three I hold the sovereignty,
And if ye list mine office to define,
'Tis I alone who perfect certainty
Of earthly things possess, and things divine;
Aye fresh and green, a youthful heart is mine,
Youthful in seeming, but yet full of days,
For wisdom is of elder hearts the praise.

"The desert through which I saw thee come,
Is the sad wilderness of worldly strife;
Some leave its snares and dwell with me at home,
A home with all delights and pleasures rife,
There shalt thou find grace, help, eternal life,—
'But I have travelled far and fain would rest,
Truly to-day my labor hath been blest.'"

The poet falls on his knees, and begs Sapience to tell him "her labor and her pain," and she relates the story:

"A certain prince there was, of mighty fame,
Whose worthy deeds had won him great renown;
Four daughters and a son did bear his name,
And in his house a vassal of his crown
In kindly love he cherished as his own;
He gave him one command, the which he brake,
Wherefore he now must die, for justice' sake.
For torturers the king did call to him,
And bade one put him in a prison sore;
The next should sternly flay him limb from limb,
The third should slay him, and the next devour;
The rumor quickly reached his daughters four,
Whose names were Mercy, Justice, Truth, and Peace.
But Mercy hoped his anger to appease.

"Adown she gazed into the dungeon deep,
And her loved servant saw she sitting there;
With bleeding heart she tenderly did weep
Till her fair cheeks were stained with many a tear,
And so unloosing her dishevelled hair,
She sought her Father, and full piteously
Besought his mercy on her bended knee.

* * * * * *

"'O'er all thy creatures thou hast chosen me;
I am the image of thy beauteous face;
I am thy child, thy gem most heavenly,
The minister of all thy chiefest grace,
The food that feedeth poor humanity;
Me, thy divinest treasure, dost thou name!
O, Prince of Peace! grant me the boon I claim.'"

Truth interposes to prevent too prompt a response to Mercy's appeal, and tells the Father:

"Stable thy sentence, and thy judgment just."

Mercy pleads with Truth, then Righteousness,

"Goodly and fair, yet fearful to behold;"

and argues in favor of carrying out the sentence. Mercy falls pierced through with mental pain, and Peace exclaims:

"Ye Seraphim, lay down your armoury!
Ye Cherubim, your glory cast away!
Ye thrones, henceforth hushed be your melody,"—

and the poem is characterized throughout by equal spirit and simple melody.

How great the contrast between the modernized verse of Lydgate and his own, can best be seen by presenting some of the original. These verses are taken from Dodsley's *Collection of Old Plays*.[1] It is thought that Lydgate translated the ballad from some old French poem; and Lydgate himself "annexed a kind of scenery" "somewhat pantomimical" to its dialogue, which served for stage directions:

CHICHEVACHE AND BYCORNE.

First ther shal stonde an ymage in poete nife seyeng these iij balades.

"O Prudent folkes takith heede,
And remembrith in youre lyves,
How this story doth procede,
Of the husbandes and theyr wyfes:
Of theyr accorde, and theyr stryves,
With lyf, or deth, whiche to devayne,
Is graunted to these bestes twaine.

"For this BYCORNE of his nature
Wil non other maner feede,
But pacient husbandis in his pasture;
And CHICHEVACHE etith wymmen goode;
And both these bestis, by the wode,
Be fatte or liene, it may not faile,
Like lak, or plante, of theyr vitaile.

Then shall be portrayed two bestis, oonfatte anothyr leene.

"Of Chichevache, and of Bycorne,
Trebith holy this matere;
Whos story hath taught us beforn,
Howe these bestis, bath in feere,
Have their pasture, as ye shal here,
Of men, and wymman, in sentence,
Thurgh suffrance, or thurgh impacience.

[1] London, 1780, vol. xii. p. 333.

"Of Bycorneys I am Bycorne,
Ful fatte and rounde here I stande;
And in mariage bounde and sworne
To Chichevache as hir husbonde:
Which wil nat eete, on sell, nor bonde,
But pacient wyfes debonayre,
Which to her husbondes by nat antrayre."

Then shall be portrayed a fatte beste called Bycorne, of the country of Bycorneys, and seyn these thre baladis followyng.

In the course of the "balades" Chichevache devours a "womman," and the poet gives the moral advice natural under such extraordinary circumstances. The ballad is rarely alluded to in these latter days, perhaps because, since Chichevache ate only patient husbands, and Bycorne only meek and humble wives, these wonderful "bestis" would encounter so much discouragement in a search for diet.

Lydgate was an extremely industrious poet. In the Benedictine monastery of Bury St. Edmunds he was ordained priest in 1397. He studied at Oxford, Paris, and Padua, and became a noted teacher not only of literature, and especially verse, but of general learning, including mathematics and astronomy. There are two hundred and fifty works bearing his name. He was an essentially popular writer; and if not "a poet of great genius, he was a man with music in his life." Even the grudging and reluctant Hallam is willing to concede to him some little merit, and concerning Gray's high estimate of his talent, says: "Great poets have often the taste to discern and the candor to acknowledge those beauties which are latent amidst the tedious dulness of their humbler brethren." One of the Camden Society publications[1] contains Lydgate's "verses on the Kings of England," a few of which are worthy of reprint as curiosities:

CRONYCLES OF ALLE KYNGYS OF ENGLONDE AFTYR THE CONQUESTE, AS OF HYR NAMYS ANDE WHERE THEY BENE I- BYRYEDE.

WYLLELMUS CONQUESTOR.

This myghty William Duke of Normandye,
As boky's olde make mencyon,
By juste tytylle and hys chevalrye
Made kynge by conqueste of Bruty's Albyon,
Putte owte Harrolde and toke possessyon,
Bare hys crowne fulle xxj yere,
Beryd at Cane, thys saythe thys croneculere.

WYLLELMUS RUFUS.

Nexte in ordyr by succesyon,
Wylliam Rufe his sone crownyde kynge
Whiche to Godivarde hadde noo devocyon,
Destruyd chyrchis of newe and olde byggnge
To make a foreste pleasaunte for hontynge.
Xiiij yere he bare hys crowne in dede.
Besyde at Wynchester the cronycle ye may rede.

[1] The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century, p. 41.

The chronicles are continued as far as Edward IV.

Of the martyr-poet, Robert Southwell, neither Morley (in the edition seen by the writer) nor Hallam contains a single word; yet he published many volumes, some of their contents far above the average of the compositions in rhyme of that period, which these distinguished biographers and critics discuss in detail. A Jesuit, trained at Douay, if he was not an ambitious poet, he was a pure, true, and sweet versifier; and had he yielded his conscience to the caprices of his monarch, his poetic faculty would not have failed of the lavish reward which the "Virgin Queen" was ready to bestow upon even mediocrity capable of adulation. Southwell's "Times go by Turns" survives the neglect of commentators:

"The loppèd tree in time may grow again,
Most naked plants renew both fruit and flower,
The sorriest night may find release of pain,
The driest soil sustain some moistening shower;
Time goes by turns, and chances change by course,
From foul to fair, from better hap to worse.

"The sea of fortune doth not ever flow;
She draws her favors to the lowest ebb;
Her tides have equal times to come and go;
Her loom doth weave the fine and coarsest web:
No joy so great but runneth to an end,
No hap so hard but may in time amend."

While Ben Jonson was in prison for having killed a fellow-actor in a brawl or duel, he fell under the influence of a gentle priest and became a Catholic,—as sincere a Catholic as it was possible for "Rare Ben" to be; and when sorrow no longer oppressed him, and fortune smilingly beckoned from behind the chair of royalty, Ben laid aside the garment of his prison baptism, openly renounced his adopted faith, and returned to the Church of England and the patronage of James I. Far be it from us to underrate his rank in English literature; but to classify him as one of the English Catholic poets, as has sometimes been done, seems a straining of facts. Much of his best and some of his worst work was done during the twelve years in which he remained faithful to his deeper convictions,—the only religious convictions he ever had; for, as Hazlitt says of Chaucer, "Fortitude does not appear at any time to have been the distinguishing virtue of poets." It would be vain to attempt an analysis of his dramas or minor poems for the purpose of discovering, if the discovery be possible, what influence his profession of Catholic faith may have exercised upon his pen. There are no materials which one may intelligently use in such a quest. It has been said that there are two kinds of biographies; "one is as a golden chalice, held up by some wise hand, to gather

the earthly memory ere it be spilt on the ground. The other kind is as a millstone, hung by a partial, yet ill-judging friend, round the hero's neck, to plunge him as deep as possible in oblivion."[1] No millstone could drown Ben Jonson; no friend has gathered up his memory in a golden chalice. Biographers has he had many; yet they cannot agree as to whether he and Shakspeare were devoted friends or malignant enemies; some assert that he worked as a bricklayer, "the trowel in one hand, a book in the other,"—his wages must have been small; others find him distinguishing himself against the Spaniards in the Netherlands, thereby becoming eminent above poets in general, few of whom have been famous for physical prowess; still others trace him to Cambridge, although his name appears in none of the lists. Nothing is absolutely certain except that he undertook to support himself as one of a company of strolling players; that his violent temper brought about the difficulty which resulted in his imprisonment; that while in prison he became a Catholic and so remained for twelve years, when he formally returned to the National Church and became the recipient of royal favor as the reward of his apostasy. He was released from prison about 1595; his first successful comedy appeared in 1598. The character given Jonson by Drummond is severe. He "was a great lover and praiser of himself, a contemner and scorner of others, given rather to lose a friend than a jest; jealous of every word and action of those about him, especially after drink, which is one of the elements in which he lived; a dissembler of the parts which reign in him; a bragger of some good that he wanted, thinking nothing well done, but what either he himself or some of his friends have said or done. He is passionately kind or angry, careless either to gain or keep; vindictive, but if he be well answered at himself, interprets best sayings and deeds often to the worst. *He was for any religion*, as being versed in both; oppressed with fancy, which hath overmastered his reason, a general disease in many poets." A poet who "was for any religion" is small credit to any, yet his fancy became at times thoroughly imbued with religious feeling. One of his "poems of devotion," rarely printed, is entitled the "Sinner's Sacrifice:"

"O holy, blessed, glorious Trinitie
Of persons, still one God in unitie,
The faithfull man's beleeved mysterie,
Helpe, helpe to lift

"My selfe up to thee, harrowed, torne and bruis'd—
By sinne, and Sathan, and my flesh unus'd,
As my heart lies in pieces, all confus'd,
O take my gift.

[1] Studies in Poetry and Philosophy. By Prof. J. C. Shairp.

"All-gracious God, the sinner's sacrifice,
A broken heart, thou wert not won't despise,
But bore the fat of rammes or bulls, to prize,
An offering meet

"For thy acceptance, O, behold me right,
And take compassion on my grievous plight,
What odour can be then, a heart contrite,
To thee more sweet?

* * * *

"Beholding One in Three, and Three in One,
A Trinitie to shine in unitie;
The gladdest light darke man can think upon,
O grant it me!

* * * *

"My Maker, Saviour, and my Sanctifier,
To heare, to meditate, sweeten my desire,
With grace, with love, with cherishing intire,
O then how blest;

"Among thy saints elected to abide,
And with thy angels placed side by side,
But in thy presence, truly glorified,
Shall I there rest!"

The following is a portion of "An Epigram to the Queen:"

"Haile, Mary, full of grace, it once was said,
And by an angell, to the blessed'st maid,
The Mother of our Lord; why may not I
(Without prophanenesse) yet, a poet, cry,
Haile, Mary, full of honours, to my queene,
The mother of our prince?"

Perhaps it is not too much to say that the inspiration which moved Jonson, on these and similar occasions, was less gratitude to God than hope of reward from the King's wine cellar and the royal pension list; and he was not disappointed, for in the same year in which he thus made Charles's queen a little lower than the Blessed Mother of God, his majesty conferred upon the obsequious, if not pious, poet a hundred pounds per annum, and "a tierce of canary Spanish wine yearly during his life from his majesty's cellars at Whitehall."[1]

It is pleasant to turn from Ben Jonson, the better poet, to Richard Crashaw, the better man—the "saint," as even his enemies were willing to call him in life and death. Crashaw was one of the best of the school of English poets which afterwards produced Heber, Keble, and Faber, and of which Quarles and Herbert were earlier

[1] The Works of the English Poets, from Chaucer to Cowper. (Including Dr. Samuel Johnson's prefaces and criticisms, and Chalmers's Lives.) London, 1810.

members. Crashaw inherited both poetry and piety. His father was a noted preacher at the Temple Church, London, and published, besides a number of polemical treatises, a volume of sacred verses. It is not known at what precise time Richard was born. He took his bachelor's degree in 1634, and in the same year published his first book of poems, all Latin, and nearly all devotional. The verses on the miracle at Cana contain the famous line:

Nympha pudica Deum vidit et erubuit.

Crashaw took his final degrees at Oxford, was ordained in the Established Church, and became a favorite popular preacher. In 1644, refusing to take the covenant, he was compelled to leave England, and went to France. He had already accustomed himself to semi-ascetic life. He practiced austerities almost unknown outside the houses of the Catholic religious orders; his mind was essentially devout and contemplative; and, humanly speaking, it is not surprising that the harsh experiences he was compelled to undergo for conscience' sake, turned his thoughts humbly and earnestly toward the Catholic Church. While at Cambridge, he passed much of his time in St. Mary's Church, where he was said to have offered more prayers during the night than others usually during the day; and it was this habit which inspired his poems, "Steps for Happy Souls to Climb to Heaven by." He is represented as possessing accomplishments rare even in university clergymen; he was skilled in music, drawing, painting, and engraving, and read Italian and Spanish, as well as Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. At just what time he became a Catholic is unknown. "It is certain, however," says one of his biographers, in a spirit of Christian regret and apology, "that even after his arrival in Paris, he embraced the religion of the country with a sincerity which may be respected while it is pitied." Two years later Cowley found him in distress, and assisted him in becoming secretary to one of the Roman Cardinals, who secured his appointment as canon of the Church of Loretto. He died in Rome in 1650. None of Cowley's lines are more admired, or more deservedly, than those on Crashaw's death.

"Poet and saint! to thee alone are given
The two most sacred names of earth and heaven,
The hard and rarest union which can be,
Next that of Godhead with humanity.
Long did the muse's banish'd glares abide,
And build vain pyramids to mortal pride;
Like Moses thou (tho' spells and charms withstand)
Hast brought them nobly home, back to their Holy Land.

"Oh, wretched we! poets of earth! but thou
Wert living the same poet thou'rt now.

Whilst angels sing to thee their airs divine,
And joy in an applause so great as thine,
Equal society with them to hold,
Thou needs't not make new songs, but say the old;
And they, kind spirits! shall all rejoice to see
How little less than they exalted man may be."

Several successive editions of his poems were published to meet a popular demand, in a time, too, not favorable to poetry, and the poetry which it liked best was one of quaint conceit and artificial fancifulness; it was the coloring of the picture (to borrow from Pope) it wanted, without insisting on "too close an inspection of the lines and life." Crashaw's verse is nearly all in the fashion of that time. His tropes are recondite, often extravagant; sometimes so farfetched as to provoke a smile.

This is from "Steps to the Temple:"

"THE WEEPER.

"Hail, sister springs,
Parents of silver-forded rills!
Ever bubbling things!
Thawing crystal! snowy hills!
Still spending, never spent; I mean
Thy fair eyes, sweet Magdalen.

"Heavens thy fair eyes be,
Heavens of ever-falling stars,
'Tis seed-time still with thee,
And stars thou sow'st, whose harvest dares
Promise the earth to countershine
Whatever makes heaven's forehead divine.

* * * *

"Upwards thou dost weep,
Heaven's bosom drinks the gentle stream,
Where the milky rivers meet,
Thine crawls above and is the cream.
Heaven of such fair floods as this,
Heaven the crystal ocean is.

"Every morn from hence
A brisk cherub something sips,
Whose soft influence
Adds sweetness to his sweetest lips.
Then to his music and his song
Tastes of this breakfast all day long.

"When some new bright guest
Takes up among the stars a room,
And heaven will make a feast,
Angels with their bottles come,
And draw from these full eyes of thine,
Their master's water, their own wine."

* * * *

This, entitled "Easter-Day," is less open to criticism:

"Rise, heir of fresh eternity,
From thy virgin tomb:
Rise, Mighty man of wonders, and thy world with thee,
My tomb, the universal rest,
Nature's new womb,
My tomb, fair Immortality's perfumed nest.

"Of all the glories make noon gay,
This is the morn.
This rock buds forth the fountain of the streams of day,
In joy's white annals lives this hour,
When life was born,
No cloud scoul on his radiant lids, no tempest lowre.

"Life, by this light's nativity
All creatures have.
Death only by this day's just doom is forced to die,
Nor is death forced; for may he lie
Thron'd in thy grave;
Death will on this condition be content to die."

In an elaborate poem on Saint Teresa, occur these lines:

"Scarce had she learnt to lisp a name
Of martyr, yet she thinks it shame
Life should so long play with that breath
Which, spent, can buy so brave a death."

None of his verses are sweeter than those which he has called by the modest name of "A Song:"

"Lord, when the sense of thy sweet grace
Leads up my soul to seek thy face,
Thy blessed eyes breed such desire,
I die in love's delicious fire.
O love, I am thy sacrifice,
Be still triumphant, blessed eyes,
Still shine on me, fair suns, that I
Still may behold, though still I die.

"Though still I die, I live again,
Still longing so to be still slain;
So gainful is such loss of breath,
I die even in desire of death.
Still live in me this loving strife
Of living death and dying life.
For while thou sweetly slayest me,
Dead to myself, I live in thee."

To close this division of the subject, bare allusion may be made to a very eccentric gentleman, who must perforce be included among English Catholic poets,—Sir Samuel Tuke. He was not a great poet; he probably was not much of a Catholic. There was little piety abroad in his time; but he was an overpowering flunkey, a most amusing snob. He was a colonel of horse in the army of

Charles II., and fought against the Parliament "as long as the affairs of his master had any prospect of success." He was created a baronet in 1664, and married, says the chronicle, "Mary, daughter of Edward Sheldon, a lady who was one of the dressers to Queen Mary, and probably a Roman Catholic, of which persuasion our author seems also to have been." After the Restoration, he intended to retire into private life, but the King persuaded him not to do so, and honored Sir Samuel with a request to adapt one of Calderon de la Barca's plays ("The Adventures of Five Hours") to the English stage. The play itself it is unnecessary to say anything about. Sir Samuel's "Prologue to the Pit" will be quite enough.

"As to a dying lamp one drop of oil
Gives a new blaze, and makes it live awhile;
So, th' author, seeing his decaying light,
And therefore thinking to retire from sight,
Was hindered from the upper sphere,
Just at that time he sought to disappear.
He chanc'd to hear His Majesty once say
He lik'd this plot, he stay'd and writ the play:
So should obsequious subjects catch the minds
Of princes, as your seamen do the winds.
If this attempt, then, shows more zeal than light,
It may teach you to obey, though not to write.
Ah! he is there himself! Pardon my sight!
My eyes are dazzled with excess of light;
Even so the sun, who all things else displays,
Is hid from us i' the glory of his rays.
Will you vouchsafe your presence? You, that were given
To be our Atlas, and support our Heaven?
Will you (dread sir!) your precious moments lose
To grace the first endeavors of our muse?"

* * * * *

The old text has a "†" after "Ah! there he is himself;" and the marginal reference is, "He, looking up and seeing the King, starts," and at the appropriate places in the subsequent lines, "He kneels," and, anon, "he rises." The play reached, not surprisingly, several editions, to the third of which Sir Samuel writes a preface, in which he advises the reader that, although the work is a translation, he may be allowed to "do himself the justice" of saying "that there are several alterations in the copy which do not disgrace the original." Justice to Sir Samuel requires the addition of an important fact in his literary career—whether, however, the work alluded to was in metre or not, the writer is unable to state. "Sir Samuel was one of the first members of the Royal Society, and wrote a history of the ordering and generation of green Colchester oysters, printed in Spratt's History, p. 307."[1]

[1] Old Plays, vol. xii. p. 4.

Of Sir William Davenant it is needless to say more than a passing word. He adopted the Catholic faith, shared the exile of Queen Henrietta Maria in France, was appointed poet laureate after Ben Jonson died, and as an author was more fecund than original. His industry greatly exceeded his gifts. His place is more properly in the history of the stage, for he was conspicuously connected with the restoration of the drama after the Puritans had done their best to obliterate it from English life. Sir William when a child had known Shakspeare, and cherished for his sublime genius a profound admiration which found its expression in adaptations of the great poet's plays to the improved mechanical arrangements of the boards during the reign of Charles II., adaptations which would more become one of Shakspeare's most wicked enemies. Dryden assisted him in making a better "playing version" of "The Tempest." It was during Sir William's time that women first played in the modern theatre, their parts having been previously played by boys. In 1639 Charles I. authorized Sir William to build a theatre in London; in 1662 Charles II. renewed his license, extending it to London, Westminster, or the suburbs, Thomas Killigrew being the only other person in the realm to whom a like privilege was granted. His Majesty prudentially forbade any actor to go from one company to the other without the manager's consent, and to secure the two favorites in their monopoly, suppressed all other companies. He seems also to have been anxious to purify and reform the drama, and to this end wrote that as "the women's parts therein have been acted by men in the habits of women, at which some have taken offence, for the preventing of these abuses for the future, we do hereby straitly charge and command and enjoyn, that from henceforth no new play shall be acted by either of the said companies, containing any passage offensive to piety and good manners, . . . and we do likewise permit and give leave that all the women's parts . . . may be performed by women, so long as these recreations, which, by reason of the abuses aforesaid, were scandalous and offensive, may by such reformation, be esteemed not only harmless delights, but useful and instructive representations of human life, to such of our good subjects as shall resort to see the same." Sir William's longest poem, "Gondibert," is very dull and dreary. Neither in it nor in his best short ones is there any evidence of a pious Catholic spirit. His connection with the stage, his chivalric personal character, his acquaintance with Shakspeare in childhood and with Milton in manhood, from whom he received and to whom he rendered personal favors, and the striking adventures of his political and military life, are the chief elements of the interest he still awakens.

Like Ben Jonson, Dryden espoused the Catholic faith in man-

hood; like Ben, he "was for any religion" which supplied his ambition and talent with opportunity; like Jonson and Davenant, he became poet laureate, and his adulatory muse was as fulsome as theirs towards rank, power, and wealth. Occupying the first place in the second rank of poets, and acknowledged the father of English criticism, the beginning of his literary career was as bad as that of any of his contemporaries in a depraved period, its close found him eminent above the best. Whatever his motives in embracing the only creed which imposed restraints upon the imagination and infused a blush upon the face of the licentious literature of the time, his enemies are willing to admit that in the dozen years of his life following his conversion, his ideals were more refined, his aim higher, his pen purer. "It is the age," says Macaulay, "that forms the man, not the man the age." Dryden was of his age until the strenuous grasp of the Church led him ahead of it into a clearer atmosphere. "The sun illuminates the hills," adds Macaulay in the same essay, "while it is still below the horizon, and truth is discovered by the highest minds before it becomes manifest to the multitude." The sun for Dryden was religion. Faith led him up the hills, and on their summits he caught the gleams of the glorious light whose spreading rays shone later over all England, and whose sanctifying warmth is gradually winning back the best of the nation to the altars of their fathers.

The first impression I obtained of Pope, before reading any of his poems, was from Hazlitt.[1] Opening the volume carelessly, I read "It cannot be denied that his chief excellence lay more in diminishing than in aggrandizing objects; in checking, not in encouraging our enthusiasm; in sneering at the extravagances of fancy or passion, instead of giving a loose rein to them; in describing a row of pins and needles, rather than the embattled spears of Greeks and Trojans; in penning a lampoon on a compliment, and in praising Martha Blount." Martha Blount was one of the most noted Catholic women in English society; and that Pope honored her with admiration and respect, is at once a proof that the purest and most intimate friendship may exist between persons of the opposite sex, from childhood to the grave; and, at the same time, is conclusive testimony that Pope was neither afraid nor ashamed of the faith in which he was born, which always exercised upon his conduct a beneficent influence, and which "taught him how to die."

[1] Lectures on the English Poets and English Comic Writers. By William Hazlitt. London. A curious instance of failure to understand the use of quotation-marks is furnished in the "Globe" edition of Pope's Poems (New York). In the preface more than two entire pages are taken from this lecture by Hazlitt, slightly altering the text, without informing the reader, even by the simple device of inverted commas, that the exceedingly clever writing is not the professed editor's.

Hazlitt says that Pope was in poetry what the skeptic is in religion. Less from this, than from Hazlitt's analysis of his style in general, the inference is reasonable, in advance of an examination of his poems, that skepticism was a pervading quality of his mind. The falsity of such an expectation is quickly dissipated by the poems themselves, by those written in his youth as well as by his maturer efforts. The early development of his talent is unprecedented in the literature of any country or period. When only eight years old, he was placed in charge of a Catholic priest, and his tuition appears to have been superintended by ecclesiastics for a considerable time. "When I had done with my priests," he says, "I took to reading by myself, for which I had a very great eagerness and enthusiasm, especially for poetry, and in a few years I had dipped into a great number of English, French, Italian, Latin, and Greek poets. This I did without any design but that of pleasing myself, and got the languages by hunting after the stories in the several poets I read, rather than read the books to get the languages. I followed everywhere as my fancy led me, and was like a boy gathering flowers in the fields and woods, just as they fall in his way. Those five or six years I still look upon as the happiest part of my life. In those rambles of mine through the poets, when I met with a passage or story that pleased me more than ordinarily, I used to endeavor to imitate it, or translate it into English; and this gave rise to my imitations, published so long after." At sixteen his pastorals were written, and he began "Windsor Forest;" at twenty-one, his "Essay on Criticism" was first printed by Lewis, a Catholic bookseller of Covent Garden; at twenty-four the "Rape of the Lock," "the most exquisite specimen of *filigree* work ever invented," according to Hazlitt, which had, however, the more substantial merit of reuniting two families who had been estranged by Lord Petre's having capriciously cut off a lock of Mrs. Fermor's hair; the "Messiah," a sacred eclogue, in imitation of Virgil's "Pollio," was produced about the same time; at thirty, his version of the "Iliad" was completed, a translation "extravagantly free," as Matthew Arnold says, but displaying "prodigious talent,"[1] and from this time until very nearly his last days on earth, his pen was busy. Throughout his thousands

[1] "In elevated passages he is powerful as Homer is powerful, though not in the same way; but in plain narration, where Homer is still powerful and delightful, Pope, by the inherent fault of his style, is ineffective and out of taste. Wordsworth says somewhere, that wherever Virgil seems to have composed 'with his eye on the object,' Dryden fails to render him. Homer invariably composes 'with his eye on the object,' whether the object be a moral or material one Pope composes with his eye on his style, into which he translates his object, whatever it is. That, therefore, which Homer conveys to us immediately, Pope conveys to us through a medium."—"*On Translating Homer*," *Essays on Criticism*, pp 300, 301.

of lines of satire upon the follies, the foibles, the vices, the sins of mankind, there is not a sentiment which can be construed into satire upon virtue or moral nobility or sincere piety. Indeed, his cynicism spared nothing but virtue; and when his physical condition and the spirit of his age are taken into account, it appears not too much to say that virtue itself, when associated with prosperity, ease, and distinction, might not have been so fortunate but for the wholesome effect of his early education and the daily influence of his mother, who died at the age of ninety-three, and his devotion to whom has left the world a model of filial constancy and manly tenderness. His body was crippled and deformed, a "Pandora's box, containing all the physical ills that ever afflicted humanity," Chesterfield says, in extenuation of Pope's irritability. Disease made him petulant; his philosophic spirit, matured too early, nursed a morbidness in his disposition toward brainless rank, prosperous stupidity, exalted foppishness, and masquerading sin in prelatical lawn, or the spangled robes of courtly office. His lips wore habitually the cynical smile which his pen as habitually transferred to his pages; he was bitter and vindictive toward his enemies, as unrelenting in dislike as he was fixed and indulgent in friendship; but, to his credit be it written, he was the first English poet whose pen was not for sale to every applicant with means to buy. His praise and his censure were equally free from suspicion of mercenariness, and as time rolls by, the asperities of his career and the cynicism of his greatest compositions are alike forgotten by those who enjoy his wit, learn from his wisdom, and admire his elegance, and who find that the closest tie between Pope and posterity is "Vital Spark of Heavenly Flame."

It is necessary to claim Tom Moore as a Catholic poet; he has written, however, very little Catholic poetry. Like too many more of his countrymen, he set upon his pleasure a higher price than on his conscience or his reputation, and the graceful talent which might have been employed for the glory of God and the honor of his country, was speedily attracted by the dazzle of an alien society, which detested his creed as it despised his nation, and of this society Moore soon became the patronized pet and the effeminate victim. The son of a small tradesman, who in addition to social obscurity was under the ban of being a Catholic, Tom Moore, born May 28th, 1779, entered Dublin University at fourteen, ashamed of his origin, dubious about his religion, vainly conscious of his readiness to string rhymes together, and ambitious of literary eminence. He aspired to a classical premium for his translations of the Odes of Anacreon, and was disappointed. The University bestowed none of its honors upon papists. One of the most pleasing reminiscences of his university life is his sketch of his

fellow-student, Robert Emmet, whose manly character and tragic fate he afterwards commemorated in several of his most touching poems. His taste for music was indulged while quite young by tuition on the piano, on which he became a pleasing performer, and he acquired some skill also in the French and Italian languages. Thus accomplished, he went to London in 1798, while many of his university friends and Dublin companions were giving the government serious trouble, and having entered at the Middle Temple as a law student, he devoted his time more to poetry and society than to legal principles. His dedication of his first volume of translations to the Prince of Wales, afterwards George IV., was a humiliating confession of his anxiety for a place in those circles of fashion, frivolity, and license into which he could be admitted only as a renegade Irishman and an apostate Catholic. A formal apostasy he did not, indeed, avow, but he withdrew from actual connection with the Church, and without becoming a Protestant, ceased to be a Catholic. Thoroughly, if gradually, his parents' faith lost hold of his mind, and his children were brought up in the Church of England. His journal, kept with a minuteness inseparable from overweening vanity, is a mass of trivial details that would be dull but for the names of the personages that occur in them. He basked in the most brilliant and the best—that is, the worst—society of the United Kingdom, and qualified himself for its entertainment by his first volume of poems, published under a pseudonym, and imbued with sweetness of jingle and moral impropriety. The Prince of Wales is said to have never recognized him after learning that he was an Irish grocer's son, but Byron and the Countess Guiccioli made amends, and he writes with as much familiarity of the nobility as did his father of teas and treacle. He became acquainted with most of the literary men of the time, and after his ridiculous duel with Jeffrey, in which the combatants' pistols were loaded with paper billets, was enrolled as a contributor to the *Edinburgh Review*. A number of essays attributed to him have recently been published in this country, together with some bad verse, which in justice to his fame ought to have been kept out of currency. One of these essays, entitled "The Fathers," would have been deemed worthy of Voltaire, and gracious, as coming from him. Its ribald humor, gross historical inaccuracy, bitter satire, and coarse blasphemy are painfully suggestive of the French school of which the greatest of modern iconoclasts, by merit raised to that bad eminence, was the head. It is hard to believe that so pungent but so irreverent a diatribe emanated from the pen which polished these lines:

"As down in the sunless retreats of the ocean,
Sweet flowers are springing no mortal can see;
So deep in my soul the still prayer of devotion,
Unheard by the world, rises silent to Thee,
My God! silent to Thee,
Pure, warm, silent to Thee.

"As still to the star of its worship, though clouded,
The needle points faithfully o'er the dim sea,
So, dark as I roam in this wintry world shrouded,
The hope of my spirit turns trembling to Thee,
My God! trembling to Thee,
True, fond, trembling, to Thee."

In his later years he made some amends for the weakness and the folly of his youth, and one of his prose works, "Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion," may have aroused in other hearts the grace which was dormant in his own. His "Irish Melodies" no doubt assisted O'Connell in his struggle for emancipation, although they were not published in a collected form until 1834, and their effect was lessened by the versatility with which the poet could weep one hour for his country and smile the next with her enemies.

"The harp that once through Tara's hall
The soul of music shed,"

broke its silence when occasion offered to utter

"Contempt on the minion who calls us disloyal."

Moore's muse got her pen from Iris. The tints of the rainbow are over all his work. It is what we may call atmospheric verse; it is radiant with fleeting and glowing hues. It is all tears and sunshine. It is partly poetry of the lawn and the summer night terrace; the stars glisten in it, the moon's pale beams shine through it lambently, it is fragrant with perfume, it sighs in "airs, languid airs." When it goes indoors it is the poetry of the drawing-room theatricals, of mimic heroism, of history wrought by ladies' fingers into tapestry, of pretty music, sparkling wine, and languishing eyes. "His fancy," says Hazlitt, "is ever on the wing, flutters in the gale, glitters in the sun. Everything lives, moves, and sparkles in his poetry, while over all love waves his purple light. 'So work the honey bees,' extracting liquid sweets from opening buds, so the butterfly expands its wings to the idle air, so the thistle's silver down is wafted over summer seas." That he was religious "by turns," if not "long," is very likely; at least his fancy was pleased at times to touch religious themes, and even these it adorned. "Come, Ye Disconsolate" is a singular contrast to the stifling sensuousness of "Lalla Rookh." "Sound the Loud Tim-

brel" is a splendid, if too brief, effort at rising above the simpering sighs of "Love's Young Dream," and he who reads "O! had We some Bright Little Isle of Our Own," without knowing its author, will be much puzzled to discern that the same hand wrote "This World is all a Fleeting Show." One poem is worthy of being transcribed here in full. Its beauty and its prayerfulness increase the regret that a heart capable of expressing true devotion so tenderly should have known it only as a subject of poetic skill:

"OH! TEACH ME TO LOVE THEE.

"Oh! teach me to love thee, to feel what thou art,
Till, filled with the one sacred image, my heart
Shall all other passions disown,
Like some pure temple, that shines apart,
Reserved for thy worship alone.

"In joy and in sorrow, through praise and through blame,
Thus still let me, living and dying the same,
In thy service bloom and decay—
Like some lone altar, whose native flame
In holiness wasteth away.

"Though born in this desert, and doomed by my birth
To pain and affliction, to darkness and death,
On thee let my spirit rely—
Like some rude dial, that fixed on earth,
Still looks for its light from the sky."

Frederick William Faber is the first true Catholic poet since the Reformation. Other poets were Catholic on occasion, he was never aught else. Other poets were Catholic when fortune made them such; he became a Catholic when to do so was to surrender everything that is humanly dearest to the heart. Others gave to the Church weak verse of youth, or the senile offering of remorseful age; he devoted his manhood to her service, and found his highest happiness in wreathing upon her brow the laurels which the world would have been so glad to bind upon his own. Nor was he more Catholic than poet. The latter he was born; had he been less a poet he might not have had the grace to become the former. His keen mind found itself between two paths: the one led through Anglicanism to Calvinism, thence to skepticism, thence to infidelity; the other was marked by a cross whose right arm pointed toward Rome. Had he not been a poet he would have chosen the former and become a cynic, or lived and died, like Keble, the victim of his doubts, lacking the strength and the courage to solve them. He was born, too, in a poetical environment, June 28th, 1814, in a picturesque region, whose beauties Walter Scott and Wordsworth have celebrated, and which even as a lad he discovered for himself;

his solitary boyish rambles led him through the mountains, along brooksides, into tangled copses, down through smiling valleys, and among hills and lakes whose peaceful aspect soothed his ardent fancy, and whose charms served only to make him love and adore the Creator. Of these days he wrote afterwards: "The forests were replanted; the chases were again filled with deer, the ancestors of the red deer of the Duke of Norfolk, which still drank at the brink of Ullswater by Lylph's tower; the heronries slanted again over the edges of the lakes; the unpersecuted eagles woke the echoes of Helvellyn; speartops glanced in the sun on the steep paths, that lay like pale green threads across the mountains; the castles rang with arms; the bright ivy had not troubled the ruddy sandstone beacons which warned men of the Scotch; the abbeys and chantries were haunted by church music, while the lesser cells in the secluded pastoral vales heard once more the nightly aspirations of wakeful prayer, and Cistercian shepherds could scarcely be distinguished in their white habits from the sheep they tended, as they moved across the fells high up above their moorland granges."

No wonder that he writes,

"Blame not my verse if echoes of church bells
With every change of thought or dream are twining,
Fetching a murmuring sameness from the fells,
And lakes and rivers with their inland shining."

No wonder that he wrote "to a bookish friend:"

"Talk not of books; thou hast not been with me,
Free and bareheaded where the wind is wildest,
Lifting its loud voice on the trembling sea,
Or riding fast o'er Loughrigg's many knolls;
No, nor where ebon night's dread power is mildest,
In Kirkstone, when the wandering night-wind tolls
Hoarse minute-bells among the rocky towers,
Nor lurked at noon in Brakay's hazel bowers.
Thou hast not seen the dawn's first blushing beams
Gild the gray battlements of Ravenscar,
The hills, the pines, the hundred foamy streams,
Nor talked all night to some most heavenly star,
Where solitude hath got her holiest dwelling,
By the black lane where Fairfield meets Helvellyn!"

Passionate love of nature, combined with artistic skill to convey to others the impressions of this love, is the supreme test of the poet. So tested, there is not a nobler, a truer, a more accurate, a more tuneful poet in our language than Faber. Had he not been a Christian, nature would have been τὸ πᾶν to him, and he would have worshipped it with mystic rites unconscious of the evolutionary iconoclasm which, while aiming to exclude God from his universe, erects therein no other altars. Being Catholic, he found "nature but the name of an effect whose cause is God."

"Superstition is the poesy of life," says Goethe; "so that it does not injure the poet to be superstitious." To Faber nature was poetry, because nature is a part of religion, since it is all an emanation from God. Poetry loves mystery; nature, to the true poet, is one of the mysteries of religion. The love of nature is as necessary to the poet as religion is to reason. Of late, alas! there has been as little religion in reason as nature in poetry. It is fashionable to call by the latter name a sensuous style in which there is neither nature, nor reason, nor religion; and to avoid religion itself has become the chief task of reason.

How true a poet Faber is, is little suspected by those whose leisure has not been regaled with his verse. The fervor of his love is equalled by his delicacy, aptness, grace, and correctness of description. His eye was so fond of beauty, that even the ceremonial of the Church so delighted him as to cause self-reproach:

"So lightly doth God's presence rest,
So little inward turned my soul,
So much beneath the eye's control,
That holy pomp and pageant rare,
Only make poetry spoil prayer."[1]

The power of these lines is unsurpassed in simplicity:

"The clouds lay folded on the mountain's brow,
A huge and restless curtain drooping low;
This way and that it waved with solemn swell,
And from behind it flakes of sunlight fell
On many a patch of redly withering fern.
Melting away upon them far above
Vast shapes were seen, uncouth and horrible,
Masses of jagged rock that seemed to move,
Turning where'er the rolls of cloud did turn,
Piled up on high, a grim and desolate Throne;
But no one was there who might sit thereon.
All preparation had been made for One
Who had not come. Ah! surely we must say,
They looked for God being out on some great work that day!"

In "The Dream of King Crœsus" this remarkable sketch appears:

"How beautiful are still and starry nights
On the great plains of Asia! And how clear
The yellow moon in glossy-foliaged dells,
Where shrunken brooks are trickling through the night!
* * * * * *
The dome of Heaven scarce arched above the earth,
With the low-hanging moon, and lustrous stars
Orb-like and swollen with unusual light.
The night-wind, fragrant with a thousand germs,
Moaning, as weary of its homeless life,

[1] "The Styrian Lake."

Over those countless leagues of inland steppe,
The little tents, the smouldering fire of wood,
The scattered arms, the horses on the plain,
Dim, dusky figures feeding, or at rest;—
What Atys and Adrastus saw is still
Seen nightly in that old unchanging land."

The influence of Wordsworth upon the poetic inclination of Father Faber includes an episode which casts serious discredit upon the former. In a letter[1] dated January 15th, 1835, he writes to a friend announcing his intention to have nothing more to do with politics "because they asperitize my mind, a thing which ought never to happen to a Wordsworthian." Father Bowden says:[2] "In most of his compositions it is apparent that his master and model was Mr. Wordsworth. When at Ambleside he was a great favorite with the venerable poet, but some years previous to that time he had been proud to style himself a Wordsworthian. The admiration was reciprocal, and on one occasion when staying at Elton, Mr. Wordsworth remarked that 'if it was not for Frederick Faber's devoting himself so much to his sacred calling, he would be the poet of his age.'" How great a compliment was this from a man who was wont to affirm that he was himself the greatest poet of the age! But Frederick Faber had not at that time become a Catholic priest. Mr. Aubrey De Vere in his "Recollections of Wordsworth,"[3] with whom he became acquainted in 1842, or about eight years before Wordsworth's death, details a portion of their conversation, in which Wordsworth said: "Indeed, I have hardly ever known any one but myself who had a true eye for nature—one that thoroughly understood her meanings and her teachings—except (here he interrupted himself) one person. There was a young clergyman named Frederick Faber, who resided at Ambleside. He had not only as good an eye for nature as I have, but even a better one, and sometimes pointed out to me on the mountains effects which, with all my great experience, I never detected." In 1845 Wordsworth was seventy-five years of age. He had endured during nearly his entire poetic life derision, contempt, scorn; during a part of his career he had suffered keen want; to his last days he knew the pain of being misunderstood and reviled. His own religious convictions, such as they were, had undergone radical change from time to time.

"No wise beautiful
Was Marian Erle. She was not white nor brown,
But could look either like a mist that changed
According to being shone on more or less."[4]

[1] Life and Letters of F. W. Faber, by J. E. Bowden, p 45.
[2] Life and Letters, p. 461.
[3] Catholic World, vol. xxii. p. 330.
[4] Mrs. Browning's "Aurora Leigh."

About the time that Father Faber became a Catholic, "the aged poet might be seen in green old age (and who that has seen that venerable figure will forget it?) either as he moved about the roads in the neighborhood of Rydal Mount, or drove towards Grasmere or Ambleside in his small rustic-looking phaeton, or as he appeared on Sundays, in the corner of the family pew near the pulpit, in the small church of Rydal. There, Sunday by Sunday, he was seated, his head inclining forwards, and the long silver-white hair like a crown of glory on either side of his majestic brow."[1] This venerable man, who had known Frederick Faber from his boyhood, who was intimately acquainted with his every virtue—and if he had any vices, neither friend nor critic has delivered them to us; who had accepted as incense his homage and given homage in return; who even in his old age, confessed that he was indebted to Frederick Faber; he who would not compare his own work with any others, Wordsworth, when he heard that Frederick Faber had become a Catholic, wrote him a letter renouncing his friendship![2]

The hymns of Father Faber endear him most closely to the heart of Christian faith, both Catholic and Protestant. So thoroughly do they pervade the hymnody of all the sects that all forget the author died a priest of the Oratory, and that almost his last wish was that every line which his pen bequeathed to religion might help to win souls into the fold in which he found truth, grace, and peace. It has been well said that "the peculiar character of Father Faber's hymns, as of all that he wrote, consists in this, that they are full of theological instruction, while they establish each Christian virtue which they aim at producing on the solid dogmatic basis, which is at once its only real motive, and its only secure defence."[3] In every collection of sacred lyrics Father Faber's hymns are found; their holy ardor, their sweet calm, their melody, unconscious, as it were, to the poet himself, commend them irresistibly to every pure, humble, prayerful heart. His, to venture a hyperbole, is the only muse that always wrote in an attitude of prayer, with a *prie-dieu* for a desk. So universal are the thoughts of the hymns in their application to all the changing emotions of the human heart, so felicitously do they adapt themselves to all the

[1] Prof. Shairp's "Studies in Poetry and Philosophy," p. 81.

[2] "His indignation flamed out vehemently when he heard of a base action. 'I could kick such a man across England with my naked foot,' I heard him exclaim on such an occasion." De Vere's "Recollections," Catholic World, vol. xxii. p. 332.

[3] The pretended volume of Father Faber's Hymns, published by E. P. Dutton, New York, is not only incomplete, but otherwise deceptive. The editor, ashamed probably to give his name, has omitted many of the most beautiful of the later hymns, and has committed the unpardonable fault of altering (to suit his own theology) some of those he prints. The volume should be ignored by all lovers, Catholic and Protestant, of literary honesty.

vicissitudes of human life, so eloquently do they describe its joys, so tenderly do they console its sorrows, that through all literature his lines have made their way, and generally without suggestion of their modest author. Who, outside the haunter of Catholic nooks, remembers that this is Father Faber's?

"For right is right, since God is God,
And right the day must win;
To doubt would be disloyalty,
To falter would be sin."

It is the thrilling close of a hymn of striking beauty and equal directness.

"Oh it is hard to work for God,
To rise and take his part
Upon the battle-field of earth,
And not sometimes lose heart!

"He hides himself so wondrously
As though there was no God;
He is least seen when all the powers
Of ill are most abroad.

"Or he deserts us at the hour
The fight is all but lost;
And seems to leave us to ourselves
Just when we need him most.

* * * *

"Thrice blest is he to whom is given
The instinct that can tell
That God is on the field when he
Is most invisible.

"Blest too is he who can divine
Where real right doth lie,
And dares to take the side that seems
Wrong to man's blindfold eye.

* * * *

"God's glory is a wondrous thing,
Most strange in all its ways,
And, of all things on earth, least like
What men agree to praise.

* * * *

"For right is right, since God is God;
And right the day must win;
To doubt would be disloyalty,
To falter would be sin."

THE PLANTATION OF DESMOND.

ABOUT the middle of the second century of our era a division of the territory of Ireland took place between Con, surnamed "of the hundred battles," and Eoghan Mor, by which the northern half of the island was given to Con, the southern half to Eoghan, the boundary being the Eisgir Riada, a line of gravel hills extending almost straight from the mound on which Dublin Castle is built to the head of the peninsula of Marey, near Clarenbridge in the County Galway. Some fifty years later, Oliol Olum, son of Eoghan, and king of the southern half or Eoghan's share, as it was then called, at his death divided his kingdom into two parts. To the descendants of his eldest son Eoghan he left Desmond or South Munster; Thomond or North Munster was given to a younger son, Cormac Cas. Desmond then included the vast tract of country from Lismore to Brandon Head in Kerry, the western parts of Waterford, Clancare, which lay along the sea between Dingle Bay and the Kenmare River, Bear, lying between that river and Bantry, and Iveragh, situated between Bantry and Baltimore; in the County Limerick it included the small barony of Iraghtyconner. The kingdom of Thomond extended from Loop Head to Ballaghmore in Upper Ossory, and from Slieve Aughty on the frontiers of Clare and Galway to Slieve Fiedlemigh in the County Tipperary. The remaining portion of the south he left to be governed alternately by the reigning princes of Desmond and Thomond, by a settlement known in Irish history as "the law of alternate succession;" a rule which proved a source of perpetual discord, and was very irregularly observed. For about a century this law was respected; but, at the death of Oliol Flan Mor in 313, the sovereignty of "Eoghan's share" passed into the hands of Eoghan's descendants, and remained with them uninterruptedly for six hundred years. During all this time, however, Thomond, the special inheritance of the descendants of Cormac Cas, the younger brother, was not interfered with by the princes of Desmond. It was not until the reign of Brian Boroihme that these recovered their legal rights; and to indemnify themselves for centuries of wrong, they sought to continue the succession thenceforth in their own family exclusively. In 978 Brian marched against the rival race of Eoghan, and came to an engagement with them near Macroom; he defeated them and their allies the Danes with great slaughter. After this disaster the race of Eoghan were but too willing to give up their rivalry and to make peace with the conqueror on his own terms. They were defeated, but not so utterly subdued, however, as to put

aside all thought of recovering their right. The day after the battle of Clontarf dissensions broke out among the leaders of the victorious army, the chiefs of Desmond asserting their claim to the sovereignty now that the great Dalcassian king was dead. Yet in spite of their protests Cormac's descendants held possession of the throne for a century and a half longer. In 1136 Cormac, the grandson of Carthach, from whom is derived the name of the clan MacCarthy, succeeded in obliging Conor O'Brien to admit him to a share of the sovereignty. For the next half century the history of the South of Ireland is little more than a record of intestine strife between the descendants of Brien striving to retain the supreme power, and the MacCarthys struggling to uphold their rights, of massacres, burnings, and plunderings wrought by one party or the other in various parts of Munster, varied only by the incursions of the men of the north, of Meath, or of Connaught, at all times ready to take up arms against their common enemy, the chiefs of Desmond. Thus we read in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, under the date 1124, that a plundering army was led into Munster by O'Connor; he put to death the hostages of Munster, among whom was Cormac, son of MacCarthy; and in 1127, an army was led by O'Connor by sea and land until it reached Cork, in Munster; and he drove Cormac to Lismore and divided Munster into three parts. In 1151 took place the great battle of Mainmoor, in which 7000 of the men of Munster were slain by the combined armies of the kings of Connaught, Leinster, and Meath. No wonder that the annalists say that "all Munster was much impoverished by the continual strife between the MacCarthys and the O'Briens contending against each other," or that "such dearth prevailed, that the peasantry were dispersed and many of them perished of famine."

And so we come to the time when a new enemy was to invade Munster and to take lasting possession of it. Such internecine wars, so fierce, so long continued, must have made the country an easy prey to the first comer. "Nothing," wrote Tacitus, a thousand years before, when speaking of the success of the Roman arms, "nothing is such a help to us against states even the most powerful as their neglect of taking counsel together for their defence." When Dermot MacMorrogh was driven for his crimes from Ireland, he besought aid from Henry Fitz Empress, who was then far away in Aquitaine. Henry's hands were at the moment too full to take up Dermot's quarrel, though he had long entertained the project of invading Ireland, "to teach the rude inhabitants the truths of the Christian faith, and to root out the plants of vice from the field of the Lord." He gave his full permission, however, "to all his good and faithful subjects, English, Norman, Welsh, Scotch, and to all others under his sway, to unite with Dermot and to avenge the injuries

done to one whose friendship he valued for many reasons." A mere permission like this was but poor comfort to Dermot; "yet," says Campion, "with these letters and many gay additions of his own he arrived at Bristol, where at a conference he fell in with Richard, Earl of Pembroke, with whom he covenanted the delivery of his only daughter and heiress in marriage, and also the reversion of the kingdom if the said Earl would recover him his home. That day were planted in Wales two gentlemen, brothers of one mother, Robert Fitz Stephen and Maurice Fitz Gerald. Fitz Stephen was in prison, but by the mediation of David, Bishop of St. David's, the third brother, and at the instance of Fitz Gerald, he was set free, in order that he and his brother Maurice should the next spring, while the Earl provided arms, assist the Irish outcast, who in consideration thereof assured them an estate forever in the town of Wexford and two cantreds adjoining. Thus much firmly concluded, the King stole secretly home and wintered closely among the clergy of Ferns." Fitz Stephen, true to his promise, set sail in May of the next year (1169), and landed at Bannow Bay, near Wexford, with 30 knights, 600 squires, and 300 footmen. The next day another party landed under the command of Maurice Prendergrast. Soon after, Maurice Fitz Gerald arrived with 10 men at arms, 30 horsemen, and about 100 foot soldiers and archers. "This Maurice," says Hollingshed, "was both honest and wise, and for truth and valor very noble and famous; well-colored and of a good countenance; of middle stature and compact in all parts, courteous and gentle; a pattern of sobriety and good behavior; a man of few words; more wisdom he had than eloquence; in martial affairs bold, stout, and valiant, yet not hasty to run headlong into any adventure; but when an attempt was once taken in hand, he would strictly follow and pursue the same."

In October, 1171, Henry II. came to Ireland. The first who went to offer him homage was Dermot MacCarthy, King of Desmond; "he threw himself at Henry's feet," says Stainhurst, "and offered to him peacefully the emblems of power which he had often before refused to give up to those who strove to obtain them by force." It is not very easy to say what his motive was for this ready submission. Was it religious obedience to what he believed was an order from the Pope, or was it a desire to gain over to his side against his hereditary foes the mailclad warriors who had come across the sea, and who had hitherto proved themselves all but invincible? Or did he wish to submit not to a king so as to resign his own power and to sink to the level of a mere subject, but to a suzerain who would protect him, while he lived a king in full under him, as O'Connor covenanted to do, rex sub eo? It is interesting to read what Sir John Davis, the Attorney-General of James I. in

Ireland, wrote four centuries later on the nature of this submission. "Though King Henry II. had the title of Sovereign Lord over the Irish, yet he did not put those things into execution which are the true marks and differences of sovereignty. For to give laws to a people, to institute magistrates over them, to punish and pardon malefactors, to have the sole authority to make peace and war: these are the true marks of sovereignty, which King Henry had not in the Irish counties; but the Irish lords did still retain all these prerogatives to themselves, for they governed the people by the Brehon laws, they made magistrates, they pardoned and punished; and this they did not only during the reign of Elizabeth but afterwards. So far was he from obtaining the royal and true sovereignty, when the Irish lords only promised to become tributaries to him; for such as pay tribute only are not properly subjects, for though they be less and inferior to the prince to whom they pay tribute, yet they hold all other points of sovereignty." Dermot MacCarthy was not the only one who submitted; O'Brien, King of Limerick, Dermot's son-in-law, was the next to swear allegiance. Fitz Patrick, King of Ossory, the Lord of Desie, and the other chiefs of Munster followed their example. O'Connor, King of Connaught, gave hostages to Henry's ambassadors. "And so," says Hanmer, "all Ireland save Ulster was brought under subjection."

Soon after the English invasion MacCarthy seems to have retired into the fastnesses of Kerry, as to a place of security. But domestic troubles brought the enemy to his very door. In 1176 Dermott's son, Cormac, rebelled against his father; he seized the old man and cast him into prison. Dermot sent messengers to Raymond Le Gros, then in Limerick, and besought his aid. "Raymond," says the *Book of Howth*, "as a man that was not slow to go himself among his men, spoke thereof to his followers, and they all agreed to do as he would, and turned their bands towards the country of Cork. Through their help Dermot recovered all his kingdom from his son, of which he was wellnigh put out. The son was taken and delivered to his father, who put him in prison and not long after took him and smote off his head." In return for his services, Raymond was rewarded with a considerable tract of land; there he settled his son Maurice, who became so potent that he gave his name to that part of Kerry, then called Lixnaw and afterwards Clanmaurice. His descendant, the Marquis of Lansdowne, holds it to this day.

Raymond was not the only one of the foreigners who obtained a firm footing in Desmond. In 1177 Henry II., then at Oxford, issued a charter, by which he granted to Robert Fitz Stephen and Milo de Cogan "the government of the city of Cork, with the

cantred of the Ostmen in the said city, to have and to hold so long as they should serve him faithfully; also the kingdom of Cork, except the said city and cantred, to them and to their heirs, to hold of the king and his heirs forever by the service of sixty knights, to have and to hold the same well and peaceably, freely and quietly, entirely, fully, and honorably." This grant included, it is reckoned, about 3,200,000 acres. Two years later the grantees came to a division of the spoil, Fitz Stephen retaining the three cantreds to the east, Cogan the four to the west. The rest they left undivided, intending to distribute it equally when brought under subjection. Fitz Stephen seems to have given his share to Philip de Barry, his sister's son, for we find a charter of King John, confirming his gift to William, Philip's son. Of Cogan's share a great part came to a descendant of Maurice Fitz Gerald, by his marriage with the heiress of Lord Cogan of Belvoir. Maurice had got Naas and the barony of Offaly from the Earl of Pembroke. Soon after the invasion, O'Gonnelloe, in the County Limerick, containing upwards of 100,000 acres, was ceded to the Fitz Geralds by the native sept of the O'Connels, in consideration of lands assigned them in Kerry and Clare. In 1199 King John granted to Thomas Fitz Maurice an estate of ten knights' fees for his homage and service, in the cantred of Fonternel and also in Thomond, with power to exercise criminal and civil jurisdiction among his vassals. By his marriage with Eleanor, daughter of Sir William Moriarty, all the estates in Kerry came into the family. In 1260 Prince Edward, having obtained from his father the dominion of Ireland, gave to John Fitz Thomas, for his homage and service, all the lands of the Desies and Desmond, with the castle of Dungarvan, and all the officers, rents, sheriffs, of which his wife's father, Thomas Fitz Anthony, the king's seneschal of Leinster, had died seized.

During the government of his relative, the Earl of Kildare, he was suffered to raise on the king's subjects the impositions of coyne, livery, coshering, and bonnaught, and to purchase whatever lands he pleased, by whatever service they were held of the Crown. In 1339 Edward III., wishing, as the patent declares, to honor the person of his beloved and faithful Maurice Fitz Thomas, gave to him the name and honor of Earl of Desmond, granting to him and to his heirs male, all the royal liberties within the kingdom of Kerry. In 1483 Robert Fitz Geoffrey Cogan granted to James, Earl of Desmond, all his lands in Ireland, being one-half of the County Cork, which he took possession of the following year. And so by degrees the power of the Fitz Geralds of Desmond grew in the south, by grants, by intermarriages, by purchases, and not least, perhaps, by "the strong arm," until in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries they attained to a position little short of regal;

their country formed one of the five counties palatine, the lords of which held the royalties, *i. e.*, a royal jurisdiction, by which they had the same courts and appointed the same officers as the king, who had no jurisdiction within their territories. They had a great number of vassals, and of their kindred and surname above 500 gentlemen; in time of war they could raise at a call 2000 foot and 600 horse.

Yet we must not suppose that the MacCarthys and their subject chieftains resigned their possessions to the stranger without a struggle. In 1182, for instance, we find Dermot MacCarthy renouncing his allegiance to the English monarch, and marching on Cork, where Fitz Stephen was. Raymond le Gros, then at Waterford, hearing of his companion's danger, went in all haste to his relief and obliged MacCarthy to retire. Three years later Cork was again attacked and a second time it was saved in the same way. "In 1260," writes Hanmer, "the Carties placed the Divells in Desmond, where they burned, spoiled, preyed, and slew many an innocent. They became so strong and prevailed so mightily, that for the space of twelve years the Desmonds durst not plough the ground in their own country. They slew of the Desmonds John Fitz Thomas, founder of the monastery and convent of Tralee, together with Maurice, his son, eight barons, fifteen knights, besides an infinite number of the common sort, at a place called Callan. At length, through the operation of Satan, a bone of discord was thrown between the MacCarthys, the O'Driscolls, O'Sullivans, and MacSwings, insomuch that by their cruel dissensions they weakened each other, and that the Desmond in the end overcame and overtopped them all."

Yet great as was their power, they exercised it mercifully and lovingly towards their dependants. It has often been laid to the charge of the Irish people that though conquered they have assimilated to themselves their conquerors, making them to lose their fierce nature and rude habits and planting in their place the mild qualities, the generous impulses, that even our enemies tell us are characteristic of the Irish Celt. Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit. Conquered Greece in her turn subdued the warlike Roman by infusing into his soul a love of the arts, withdrawing him from the work of war, and fostering those tastes that belong to a calmer and holier life. "Lord! how quickly doth that country change men's natures," exclaims Eudoxus; "but are not they that were once English, English still?" "No," replies Irenæus, "for some of them are degenerated and grown almost more Irish than the Irish themselves." Hibernis ipsis Hiberniores, that they were more Irish than the Irish themselves, was the crime set down to the Fitz Geralds; and to none of those who came into this island of ours,

could this crime—if crime it was—be imputed with more truth than to the Desmonds. The old English of the Pale and throughout the other parts of the kingdom despised the mere Irish, accounting them to be a barbarous people, devoid of all civility and religion. They shunned all intercourse with them, and strove to root out their language, their manners, their customs—things dearer than life itself to a warm-hearted people. But not so the Desmonds. They mixed with the native nobility and adopted their manners. They intermarried with the MacCarthys, the O'Briens, the O'Carrols, the O'Sullivans; they had their children fostered by Irish mothers; and so their foreign descent was soon forgotten, and they did not need to pay "black mail" to the native chiefs for permission to live outside the Pale, or to make a journey west of the Barrow. Gerald, the fourth earl, is said by our old chroniclers to have been "a man of marvellous mirth and affability, the most distinguished of the English then in Ireland, and even of many of the Irish, for his knowledge of the Irish language, of poetry, and of the other branches of our literature." Earl Thomas, "by the Feal's wave benighted," did not disdain to take as his wife a poor Irish girl, Catherine ny Cormac, even at the risk of alienating the affection of his followers. He asked and obtained leave from the king to send his son James to Conor O'Brien of Thomond, the Irishman, to be brought up by him, notwithstanding any statute to the contrary. One of the charges brought against Earl Thomas, who was beheaded at Drogheda in 1466, was that he had kept up alliance, fosterage, and alterage with the Irish, that he had furnished them with horses and arms, and had supported them against the king's subjects.

"At his death," says Campion, "all his kinsmen, the Geraldines, a mighty family in Munster, rose in arms, in revenge of this huge wrong. And with them all the people of Munster went out." To none of the Irish chiefs were his followers more faithful to the last than to Earl Gerald; and when his son, the godson of Queen Elizabeth, was sent over to wean the people from their affection to the Sugan Earl, then in rebellion, Carew, the president of Munster at the time, narrates "how when he came to Kilmallock on a Saturday in the evening, by the way and at his entry into the town, there was a concurrence of the people, insomuch as all the streets, doors, and windows, yea the very gutters and tops of the houses were so filled with them as if they came to see him whom God had sent to be that comfort and delight to their hearts and souls most desired; and they welcomed him with all the expressions of joy, every one throwing upon him wheat and salt, an ancient ceremony used in that province upon the election of their new officers, as a prediction of peace and plenty." The Irish army, shut up within

the walls of Limerick and threatened with all the horrors of famine, was cheered on to continue its resistance by the hope of one of the Earls of Desmond coming to its aid, who had died two hundred years before.

"They gazed
To see if in the setting sun dead Desmond's banner blazed."

In none of the glorious poems of Thomas Davis do his burning love of country, his heart-stirring pathos burst forth more grandly than in his noble ballad in praise of the Geraldines:

"True Geraldines! brave Geraldines! as torrents mould the earth,
You channelled deep old Ireland's heart by constancy and worth."

They loved their adopted country. They loved the old faith too with a tender, childlike love. All South Munster bears witness to their piety, for it is studded with the ruins of noble monasteries and churches raised by them, grand even still after three centuries of decay; Tralee, and Dunganan, and Kilmallock, and Youghal with its Franciscan and Dominican monasteries and its college, which Earl Thomas established for a warden and eight fellows and eight choristers, and Adare, with its three grand monasteries on the banks of the Maigue, rising proudly side by side. To these calm retreats did they retire, often in the very prime of life, laying aside helmet and cuirass, and don the monk's cowl; there in the peaceful shadow of the cloister they would have their bones laid, their arms the saltire cross, their motto "shanet aboo," deftly carved on cornice and capital, to remind the passer-by of the noble dead who lay sleeping near, and to ask a brief prayer for their souls.

Gerald Fitz James, sixteenth Earl of Desmond, succeeded to the title in 1558. Very soon after, his hereditary enemies the Butlers, now all-powerful by reason of their relationship to Queen Elizabeth, seized him and had him imprisoned in the Tower of London for seven years. The stern resistance of his clan caused him to be restored to freedom and later to all the honors of the earldom. In the winter of 1575, Sir Henry Sidney, the newly arrived Lord Deputy, made a royal progress through the south. Two days before Christmas he entered Cork, where he was received by the citizens with every expression of respect. For some days that he stayed there he was attended by the chiefs of the MacCarthys and the Earls of Thomond and Desmond. From Cork he went to Dublin; hardly had he reached there, when ill news came to his ears, "the Earl of Desmond did not a little stir and fall into disagreeable heats and passions, blowing words of evil digestion; he was become troublesome, committing many grievous spoils and taking the Queen's castles; and he had besides burnt a church."

A second time he was seized; the Lord Deputy invited the nobility to meet him on a given day in Dublin, in order to confer with them on matters concerning religion. On their arrival Desmond and his brother were seized and again thrown into prison, to pine away for five weary years in the Tower of London.

In their captivity they bethought them of all the dangers to which the faith of their followers was exposed, and chose their kinsman James Fitz Maurice to take the Earl's place and guide his people. James's first thought was to seek aid from Pope Gregory XIII. This was gladly given him, and for five years he carried on the war in Munster; he did not lay down his arms until he had received a solemn promise from the Queen that thenceforth the Catholic Church should be unmolested, and that the Earl and his brother should be set free. Once more he left his prison. But scarce had he landed in Ireland when he was told that a plot was laid for his ruin. He took horse and fled in all haste, not drawing bridle until he reached the mountains of Kerry. There in the midst of his people he resolved to make a stand. It is beside our purpose to enter into a detailed account of this war carried on by Earl Gerald against the English power in Ireland, a religious war in the strictest sense of the word, for not only had it the sanction of Gregory XIII., but it received substantial aid from him in arms and money; and in his letter to the clergy and people of Ireland he declared that he blessed the efforts of all those who engaged in that war, and granted to them the same indulgence as was given to those who fought against the Turks for the recovery of the Holy Land. Mr. Froude tells us how the war was carried on by the English. "Every living thing," he says, "was destroyed by which the insurrection could maintain itself. The corn was burnt in the field, the cattle were slaughtered. The men who could bear arms were out with their chief; the aged and the sick, the women and the little ones perished all in the flames of their burning homes. Famine took up the work where neither sword nor rope could reach. When of the proud clan of the Geraldines none were left but a few scattered and desperate bands, rewards were offered to those who would kill their comrades." After eight years of such warfare terms were offered by the Crown to all who would return to their allegiance, Earl Gerald and his family excepted. On the 20th of November, 1579, he was proclaimed a traitor. He lost his followers one by one; most of them were slain, and we read that he wept like a child at the loss of his men. The Lord Deputy wrote to the Queen: "The Earl, without rest anywhere, fleeth from place to place and maketh mediation by his Countess, whom yesterday I allowed to have speech with me here, whose abundance of tears betrayed sufficiently the miserable state

of herself, her husband, and their followers. He is unhoused of all his goods, and must now tread the woods and bogs. He conceals himself in glens and swamps, and in the winter kept a cold Christmas in Kilgueg woods near Kilmallock." From thence he made his way over the mountains to Kerry. Famishing with hunger, he sent a party of kerns to seize on some cattle. The owner obtained the aid of some soldiers from Castlemaine Fort and went in pursuit; they followed close on the track of the fugitives, and came up with them at Glenagunty. There they found him in a miserable cabin. A soldier named O'Kelly struck him down, and severed the head from the body, for which service the Queen ordered "that her well-beloved subject and soldier, Daniel Kelly, who slew the late traitor Desmond, should have at least for thirty years without fine as much of her lands spiritual or temporal as should amount to £30 per annum." This "beloved subject" was afterwards hanged in London for highway robbery. From Kilkenny, Ormond sent off in post-haste a welcome piece of news to the Queen. "The day after my coming hither," he wrote on the 15th of November, 1583, "I received certain word that Donnell MacMoriarty, of whom at my last being in Kerry I took assurance to serve against Desmond, being accompanied by twenty-five of his own sept and six of the ward of Castlemaine, the 11th of this month at night assaulted the Earl in his cabin at a place called Glenaguinte, near the river of the Maigue, and slew him; whose head I have sent for, and appointed his body to be hanged up in chains in Cork." A fortnight later he wrote: "I send her Highness, in proof of the good success of the service and the happy end thereof, by this bearer, the principal traitor Desmond's head, as the best token of the same and proof of my faithful service and travail." Elizabeth had the Earl's head fixed on London Bridge. And so perished the great Earl of Desmond, ingens rebellibus exemplar, a mighty warning to rebels.

His vast estates and those of his vassals, extending over 150 miles, and containing nearly 600,000 acres English measure, fell into the hands of the Crown; "a most beautiful and sweet country," says Spencer, "as any under heaven, being stored throughout with many goodly rivers, sprinkled with many very sweet islands and goodly lakes like little inland seas, the soil itself most fertile and the heavens most mild and temperate." He then goes on to describe the ruin brought about by the war. "Yet ere one year and a half, the inhabitants were brought to such wretchedness as that any stony heart would have rued the same. Out of every corner of the woods and glens they came creeping forth on their hands, for their legs could not bear them. They looked like anatomies of death; they spoke like ghosts crying out of their

graves. They eat the dead carrions, happy where they could find them, yea and one another soon after, insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of the graves; and if they found a plot of watercresses and shamrocks, there they flocked as to a feast for a time; so that in a short space there were none left, and a most populous and plentiful country was suddenly left void of man and beast." Some years after, when the Deputy Mountjoy entered Cork, the citizens entertained him with a show of plough-irons on both sides of the streets from the port to his lodgings, to intimate that the soldiers by their exactions and rapine had wasted the country and made all the ploughs to be idle which should have maintained it.

Such misery, far from exciting pity in the breasts of the English people, seemed to them rather the result of a special providence interested in promoting the welfare of the conquerors. It was their opinion that the population of Great Britain had begun to exceed its natural bounds, and that Ireland would be an excellent outlet for the surplus. The great Chancellor Bacon, in his address to King James I. some years later, puts the matter in his own plain way thus: "An effect of peace," he says, "in fruitful kingdoms, where the stock of people receiving no consumption nor diminution by war, doth continually increase, must in the end be a surcharge of people more than the territories can well maintain; which many times insinuating a want of means unto all estates, doth turn external peace into internal troubles and seditions. Now what an excellent diversion of this inconvenience is ministered by God's providence in this plantation of Ireland, wherein so many families may receive sustentation and fortunes; and the discharge also out of England and Scotland may prevent many seeds of future perturbations. So that it is as if a man were troubled for the removal of water from the place were he hath built his house, and afterwards should advise with himself to cast these waters out and turn them into fair streams or pools for pleasure, provision, or use. So shall his Majesty have a double commodity in the clearing out of a people here and making use of them there." Sir Henry Sidney's leading principle during his government was "the dissipation of the great lordships," to distribute the lands, if among English, the better; if not, yet that they be dissipated. The system under which land was then held in Ireland stood in the way of his plans; it was the property not of the chief but rather of the clan; at the chief's death his rights passed not to his lineal descendant but to the tanist, *i. e.*, one of his family best able to uphold the rights of the clan. This difficulty, however, was partly got over by inviting the great lords to surrender the lands to the Crown and to receive them back at a merely nominal rent, to be held by

English tenure, *i. e.*, with succession by lineal descent; in failure of heirs male or in case of attainder they should lapse to the Crown. The process was necessarily slow and would take many years to be brought to perfection. A readier one offered itself. "English colonists should plant the country, to the great increase of her Majesty's revenue; those who had served her Majesty would be recompensed without charge to her Majesty; and no doubt they would introduce obedience, courtesy, and christian policy into those parts."

This was not the first attempt made "to dissipate" the great estates and to introduce all these virtues from beyond the sea. In 1570 Sir Thomas Smith, Secretary to the Queen, obtained a grant of the peninsula of Ardes on the coast of Down. His son conducted a colony there, which for a time promised to be successful. But Smith was soon after slain by the O'Neils, the original occupiers of the soil; his followers returned to their homes. In 1572 a grant was made to one Chatterton and his heirs of Orier, the Fews, and the Gallowglass country in Armagh, on the terms that he should within seven years possess and plant these countries with civil subjects and have the tenants armed either as horsemen or as footmen after the English manner, according to the proportion of land they should hold. Chatterdon was slain by the Irish of Orier, and the scheme failed. In the same year the Earl of Essex undertook to plant the county of Antrim, which he had overrun shortly before. It was agreed that he should be invested with a moiety of the county, that the army engaged for the protection of the settlers should be maintained at the joint expense of the Queen and himself, each soldier receiving besides a grant of land at a merely nominal rent. He mortgaged his estates to the Queen for £10,000; many of the English nobility joined him in the enterprise. When he landed at Knockfergus, he found the O'Neils in arms; they had been told secretly by Essex's enemies at court that they might resist him with safety. They harassed him by constant attacks, and soon obliged him to withdraw. English settlers had been brought also into Leix in Leinster, the country of the O'Mores. Within sixty years the natives had rebelled eighteen times; it was only by their removal to Kerry that the colonists succeeded in establishing themselves permanently. A few years later a vast area of nearly 4,000,000 of statute acres in Ulster was parcelled out to British undertakers, London companies, Protestant bishops and incumbents, corporate towns, forts, free schools, and Trinity College.

And now the vultures were let loose to fatten on poor, famine-stricken Munster. The younger sons of younger houses were in-

vited over, "younger brethren of good discretion, who had little or nothing to dispend at home, to the intent that they should trust to nothing but to such lands as the Queen would appoint to them." These were chosen rather than persons of wealth and estate, in order to found new families and give a greater number of servants to the Queen. Before the patents were issued a young man appeared at the court of Elizabeth to assert his rights. It was James Fitz Gerald, the nephew of Earl Gerald, who claimed the estates and title of Desmond, being the heir of Gerald's elder brother, who had been wrongfully deprived of the earldom. He argued that the title had been granted to the eldest son in succession, and could not be forfeited by the rebellion of a younger son; that the blood of an innocent man could not be attainted because a cadet of the family had been a traitor. But he sung to deaf ears. The patents were signed, and James returned home, determined to bide his time. Gerald had an only son, whose god-mother the Queen was; but no danger could come from him, as he was safe within the Tower of London.

The Queen wrote to Sir John Perrott, bidding him consult with the rest of his council how the greater part of Munster, now lying waste, could be let out for her profit. It should be surveyed by special commissioners sent over for the purpose, and a Parliament held immediately for the attainder of the late rebels and the assuring of their lands to the Crown. Instructions were given to Sir Henry Wallop, Undertreasurer at war in Ireland, to Sir Valentine Browne and others, who were appointed commissioners, to take a survey of the lands of those who had rebelled within the last four years; they were to inquire who were the occupiers of any lands reputed to have been rebels, and what estate they had therein either by lease or by will. For their safety certain of the garrison should attend on the surveys, so that by the end of the next summer the plans might be appointed for the planting of the parishes. At the same time there was published in England and circulated widely, "A note of the benefits that may grow in a short time to the younger houses of gentlemen by this course in perpetuity:"

"1st. The gentleman undertaker is to be the chief lord of so great a seigniory, and to have the disposing of so many families and of so many good holdings, as the greatest portion set down in her Majesty's plan doth appear, as a thing fit for gentlemen of good behavior and credit, and not for any man of inferior calling. He is to have the royalties and perquisites of courts within the whole, and £100 per annum, to be paid yearly as the Queen's rents are paid. Then the profits he shall make of his own demesne within the first year; and when this worst year is passed, he shall have the second year corn and cattle sufficient to spend, whereby he will be at no charge; and the third year he will have corn and cattle to spare, which he may export to England and other countries to his great profit.

"2d. The gentleman who undertakes the planting of 12,000 acres is to have for his demesne a farm of 1600 acres; besides, for the chief farmer 400, for two good farmers

300 each, for two others 200, for fourteen freeholders 300 each, for forty copyholders 100 each; 800 for cottages, of which there must be at least 36. Other demesnes of 1200, 1000, and 800 acres to be divided somewhat in the same proportion. He must also people the same with families convenient according to this proposition, to be performed in four years. He must provide the following persons, viz., all his farmers and freeholders, besides a gardener, a wheelwright, a smith, a mason, a tiler for building, a tailor, a shoemaker, a butcher, and a miller."

The plan for the division of the forfeited lands, as laid down in the Queen's articles, issued on the 27th of June, 1586, was this: All the forfeited lands were divided into seigniories or lordships containing 12,000, 8000, 5000, or 4000 acres each. These estates were granted in fee farm. For the first five years they were exempted from payment of rent. For the next three years the rent was fixed at £33 6*s.* 8*d.* for each lordship of 12,000 acres; it was doubled for the three years following; the lordships of lesser extent were valued in proportion. They were free from all taxes whatever, except such subsidies as should be levied by Parliament. Bogs and mountains were not included till improved, and then one-half pence was to be paid for each acre. License was given to transport all commodities duty free to England for five years; all that was needed for the use of the lordships should be admitted duty free. No English planter could convey his lands to any of "the meere Irishe;" the head of the plantation should be English; the heirs, female, should marry none but those of English birth or descendants of the first patentees, or English of the plantation. Each freeholder after the year 1590 should furnish one horse and six armed footmen. Each principal undertaker for 12,000 acres should supply three horsemen and six footmen armed. For seven years they should not be obliged to travel out of Munster on any service, and after that time no more than ten horsemen and twenty footmen out of each lordship of 12,000 acres, and so in proportion; all who served out of Munster would be paid by the Queen, who would protect and defend said lordship at her own charge for seven years.

The Irish could not be got rid of wholly, they were needed to till the estates. It was thought good policy to rout them out of their homes and to divide them among the English, "in the hope that by observation of the civility and the good husbandry of their neighbors they might learn to conform themselves to the like qualities. But experience soon disproved this opinion, for they were no sooner set down among them than instead of imitating they scorned their courses, envied their fortunes, and longed to be masters of what they possessed. And as soon as the memory of their former rebellion and miseries was a little forgotten, they grew to contriving forged titles to the lands whereon the English had built and inclosed, making daily stealth of their goods and plots

against their lives." By planting the colonists carefully together in groups, it was thought that they would afford protection to each other and prevent the evils which attended former colonies, for "it was well known that no English colonist had ever prospered for any length of time who had Irish neighbors about him. Most commonly he would adopt after a time the manners and dress of the natives, and leave the allegiance and the religion of his fathers."

In 1589 the government called for a return of the various lordships in the hands of the undertakers, the amount of rent paid by each to the Queen, and the number of persons planted by them on the lands. We have the list made out by Sir Edward Fitton and Sir Edward Popham, the Attorney-General; it is styled "The Relation and State of the English in Munster in the Summer of 1588."

		Acres.	Rent.	Persons.
In Kerry and Desmond at 8*d.* per acre.	Sir Valentine Browne,	6,000	£100	20
	Sir Edward Denny,	6,000	100	20
	Sir William and Charles Herbert,	18,000	300	20
In Connelloe at 4*d.* per acre.	Mr. Trenchard,	12,000	150	37
	Sir William Courteney,	12,000	150	37
	Mr. Oughtread,	12,000	150	22
	Mr. Billingsby,	12,000	150	137
	Sir Edward Barkley,	12,000	150	130
In Cork at 1*d.* per acre.	Hugh Cuffee,	12,000	66 13*s.* 4*d.*	67
	Arthur Hyde,	6,000	23 6*s.* 8*d.*	24
	Phane Beecher,	12,000	66 13*s.* 4*d.*	12
	Hugh Worth,	12,000	66 13*s.* 4*d.*	12
	Sir Warham St. Leger,	12,000	33 6*s.* 8*d.*	12
	Arthur Robbins,	4,000	22 4*s.* 5*d.*	12
	George Robinson,	4,000	22 4*s.* 5*d*	12
	Mr. Read,	3,000	16 4*s.* 4*d.*	12
In Tipperary and Waterford at 1¼*d.* per acre.	Sir Edward Fitton and others,	11,000	80	60
	Richard and Alexander Fitton,	2,000		20
	Earl of Ormond,	3,000	16 13*s.* 4*d.*	20
	Thomas Fleetwood,	3,000	16 13*s.* 4*d.*	22
	Sir Walter Raleigh and his associates,	36,000		
	Lord Chancellor Hatton,	6,000	33 6*s.* 8*d.*	200

Spenser the poet, secretary to Lord Grey, Lord Deputy, had 3000 acres bestowed on him in the County Cork. His castle at Kilcolman is still standing. Sir Walter Raleigh got a warrant issued to him, granting him three and a half seigniories. *i. e.*, 40,000 acres, in Cork and Waterford. It was thought fit that Sir John Norris, the President of Munster, should have some portion of land appointed for him in such places in that province as it should be thought meet for him to reside in, so that the portion should not exceed in any one place more than 500 acres for a demesne for his house. He chose Mallow for his share. Patrick Condon and other principal persons of the province should have a reasonable portion of land allotted to them in some convenient place, with least annoyance to such as should come and inhabit there, lest no respect being had of them, they through desperation might be driven to attempt something to the disquieting of those that should repair into that realm to inhabit there. Hatton, known as the dancing chancellor, had nothing to recommend him for any

favors but the grace of his person, which had attracted the Queen's regards; by one of his contemporaries he is said to have been "a mere vegetable of the court, that sprung up at night and sank again at noon." He too got 6000 acres.

Yet in spite of all the care bestowed in founding and advancing the Munster colony, it did not thrive; the extravagant indulgences granted to it proved its ruin. Few of the settlers set themselves seriously to work to cultivate the lands; the terms on which they held were too easy to rouse the proprietors to active efforts. Besides, the estates were too vast to be managed by so small a number. The conditions too were left in most cases unfulfilled, chiefly because the native Irish were allowed to settle on the lands as undertenants. In the state papers of the time we find continually such a notice as the following: "The articles for the granting of estates are not observed here, most of the dwellers on the land being mere Irish." It could hardly be hoped that the native Irish, driven from their homes, could look on calmly at the advent of the new possessors. Hence we find John Beecher, who had one-half of the barony of Kinalmeaky passed to him by patent, complaining that "he doth not enjoy it quietly in respect of MacCarthy Reagh and the O'Mahoneys;" Hugh Worth, who had got the other half, "did receive a like disturbance." Nicholas Browne complains of "the unjust and unchristianlike practices used against him by the MacCarthys, since his father had lands allotted to him."

Ten years later Hugh O'Neill rose in rebellion. The whole of Munster joined him. The first work of the rebels was to sweep away the plantation, "they making," as Bacon says, "the work of years to be the spoil of days." The *Annals of the Four Masters* tell us "that in the course of seventeen days, the Irish left not within the length and breadth of the country of the Geraldines, extending from Dunqueen to the Suir, which the Saxons had well cultivated and filled with habitations and various wealth, a single son of a Saxon, whom they did not kill or expel." Camden says that the cause of the rising in Munster was not so much the fortunate success of the northern rebels as the hatred of the inhabitants against the English undertakers and planters, who had been settled on the confiscated lands seized after the Earl of Desmond's rebellion. "When O'Neill came southward his track was marked by their blazing homesteads, for he would have every man established in his own land as it was before the English governed Ireland." Eighteen hundred of them made their way to Waterford and thence to England. Yet they seem to have returned after the rebellion was extinguished, and the South reduced by Carew; for we find that at a review, held a few years later at Fallow, by Sir Richard Morrison, Vice-president of Munster, and the Queen's

Commissioners, "authorized to take a view of their horses and arms," there mustered a troop of 80 horse, mostly gentlemen and freeholders, completely armed, 186 pikemen, 250 men furnished with shot, in all 550, mostly English tenants planted on the lands formerly held by Sir Walter Raleigh; ten years later a body of 800 men were reviewed at Bandon Bridge, a part of the lordship that had been granted to Fane Beecher. Among the principal landowners of Cork, Kerry, and Limerick, we still meet with the same family names which are found in the list of undertakers, the descendants of most of the original grantees still holding the broad acres of which the Irish were robbed, bestowed on their ancestors three centuries ago.

SIXTUS V.

THERE is an error afloat which is too easily acquiesced in by those who ought to know better—with diffidence be it said. Neither is it an insignificant error. On the contrary, it is the very opposite, in all its bearing and significance, to the Christian faith, and is as pernicious as it is shallow. By it the true order of thought is reversed. In historical appreciation, in questions of politics, morals, religion, and social life, the human being is regarded only as a contributory unit to collective humanity, and as having no merely individual significance. He is the leaf or the twig of a vast tree, to whose development his single contribution is almost unappreciable. Writers of repute unthinkingly adopt this terminology, and write of "social progress" as if human society, or rather humanity itself, had in the course of ages developed into a higher sphere of existence than that it occupied in the days of Moses, for example, of Cyrus the Persian, of the Roman Empire, or of the Middle Ages.

The more adventurous and still shallower thinkers go even further than this. They assume, as if it were an axiomatic fact, that the individual mind has partaken of the general development, has progressed into a higher state, in such sense that it is possessed of a superior nature and more exalted powers than those possessed by the individual mind in past ages, as, for example, in what has been childishly called "the Dark Ages."

Nothing can be conceived more illusory. It has not the smallest

pretence in fact. The average human mind is what it was when Noah erected his altar on the summit of Mount Ararat, and has been ever since; just as the average olive tree is the same as it was on Mount Olivet, at the opening of the present era, and ever since the deluge retired from the globe.

Ever, adown all the ages, fresh additions have from time to time been made to the stock of human knowledge; fitfully and slowly, it is true, but yet additions. Within the epoch of time which is just closing, from causes too obvious to require naming, the departments of knowledge which are within the reach of human discovery have received important additions, with a rapidity quite unprecedented. The same causes have occasioned an extraordinary diffusion of elemental knowledge. It would be rash to denounce either the one or the other as evils. He to whom they must be ultimately ascribed fulfils in them His own all-wise and perfect ends. But it is equally rash to boast of them as unmixed blessings. Minds more enthusiastic than profound, dazzled by the brilliant discoveries of natural science, and puffed up with the pride of human achievement, have concluded, with a folly quite puerile, that all truth consists in physical phenomena, and is therefore attainable by the unaided efforts of the human mind; and they have given to this unwonted shining of the sun of natural science, and to the universal inundation of elemental knowledge, the ridiculously inappropriate names of "progress" and "enlightenment." Yet what does it all amount to? The supposed discovery of some of the laws which regulate some of the phenomena of the material universe—an analysis of physical substances and a classification, altogether arbitrary, of what we call species. But this does not bring us one whit nearer the truth; it averts no sorrow, nor is our happiness in the least its debtor. Let it be supposed that natural science had made far greater advances than in reality it has, that it had reached even the threshold of where the ultimate atom conceals the secret of phenomenal life. What then? Are we nearer to truth? Analogical argument, upon which all so-called scientific discovery is based, presents us, after all, with only the highest degree of probability. Absolute certainty cannot be predicated from it. The law of gravitation itself may yet be superseded by a more correct discovery. But were it otherwise, were we able to assert that these laws, which physical science claims to have discovered, were infallibly true, even then they would only be true, they would not be truth. We should learn from them only what an infant does when its father chastises it, or rewards it, or amuses it, or teaches it its letters. Truth is the nature of God—the hypothesis which denies the existence of such a being is not worth noticing—and in connection with it, the nature and final end of

man. Upon it all the discoveries of natural science can shed no light. They are calculated to kindle within the souls of those whose moral being is not deformed, belief in the existence of a God, ideas of His greatness, and, perhaps, of His goodness. But that is all.

The mind of the human being is not necessarily raised to a higher state by a little more or a little less of that knowledge which is within the reach of its unaided efforts. Like the other faculties, its highest attainable natural development depends upon habit. In positions of life in which a sustained habit of thought is not practicable, it is very questionable whether the supplying the mind with a few scraps of elemental information is not rather prejudicial to its development than otherwise. Thus, in an age when material interests are pursued with unwonted ardor, when the embellishments and ambitions of life are battled for with breathless anxiety, and with almost a fierceness of emulation, the average individual mind is likely to become rather dwarfed than more highly developed, however great the advance natural science may be supposed to have made. Nothing has been added to the intellectual stature of the human being by the discovery of the electric telegraph, by the invention of three-cent newspapers, or of Krupp's guns.

It follows that those who regard the individual man as merely a molecule in an irresponsible congeries, whose mutations and, if so be, developments constitute the whole subject of history, miss all the significance of events and the whole meaning of human life. The meanest individual that ever lived has a complete and distinct history of his own, more important than that of the mightiest empire that ever ruled the earth, because he is the supreme arbiter in an alternative of more tremendous moment than can be submitted to the choice of any nation however great. It is in individuals we read the times, not the times in individuals.

We are not advancing the ridiculous assertion, that the significance and interest to us of individuals—we speak of historic personages—begin and end with their individual biography, nor that the minds of such personages, and consequently their lives or history, are not biased by contemporary events or by their surroundings generally. These constitute in fact a part of their alternative. We maintain only that the apparition of remarkable individuals at certain epochs in the most unexpected manner, and under circumstances not only beyond, but completely opposed to all human anticipation, affords a strong corroborative evidence of that direct interference of the particular providence of God with the every-day life of His creatures, which is a fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith.

Whoever studies with patient impartiality the history of the Church will find, in the characters and histories of the numerous individuals who since the time of St. Peter have been chosen in rapid succession to fill the august office of the Supreme Pastor of the Christian Church, abundant proof of this proposition.

If there was ever a historic personage in whom the interposition of God in behalf of His Church was manifest, it was Sixtus V. A man of more remarkable character never occupied the Papal throne. No one ever came to it under circumstances so defiant of all reasonable probability.

The alternative of the salvation or perdition of the individual is not decided by the acceptance of the Catholic faith, unless he die immediately after that saving choice—after the sacrament which seals it: that is a lifelong battle, in which all the human odds are against him, has subsequently to be waged as a test of his fidelity. The *Credo* is only the enlistment. It is not before he has met death in the ranks that he is saved. His actions have to be measured by a standard absolutely opposed to that of this world to which he sensibly belongs. The Church has supplied him with quite a new set of motives and aspirations extremely painful to the lower nature, all whose propensities and pleasures strongly incline him towards those formidable enemies upon the final conquest of whom his salvation depends.

It is self-evident that the more powerful are the allurements, whether through the surroundings of the individual or his natural disposition, of those enemies to which his lower nature is so strongly inclined, all of which are classed under three categories, the world, the flesh, and the devil, the greater must be the risk to the fidelity of the Christian soul.

It is thus with the Church. At a time when her work was all before her, when the whole race of mankind had to be subdued to the foolishness of the cross, by a few men without a single natural qualification for the task, armed only with faith and supernatural virtue, when the scourge, or the cross, or the axe, or the savage butchery of the arena, or any of the other manifold forms of torture, which the ingenuity of persecution labored to invent, had to be confronted, none but men or women grandly in earnest embraced the missionary faith, few betrayed their loyalty; the Church was spared the scandal of seeing her armies crowded with traitors—men with the cross on their brows and the world in their hearts—of seeing even her highest officers adopting the very maxims and motives which the world inculcates and the Church condemns.

Far otherwise was it when the missionary work of the Church had been wellnigh accomplished, when her civilization had superseded that of Paganism, and a Christian bishop ruled the world

from the city of the Cæsars, and when it was as prejudicial to one's worldly interests to reject the faith as it had been to profess it.

So soon as those fierce northern tribes, who had broken the Roman empire to pieces, had yielded to the sweet charities of the Church, and to the sublime doctrine of individual liberty she revealed, they began to settle into nations whose patriotism was Christian; great Christian empires arose, and in the fervor of their young faith the grateful converts loaded the Church with temporal possessions and dignities. Burdened with the pernicious incumbrance of civil obligations, priests became magistrates and legislators, bishops became princes and even sovereigns. The evil was increased by the peculiarity of feudal customs, by which a bishop must often do homage for his fief to a layman, who chanced to be his superior lord.

This at once involved the Church in the complicated network of human policy, civil strifes and ambitions, and nationalistic rivalries. Her hosts were incumbered by a multitude of half-hearted Christians, lay and cleric, whom the faintest whisper of probable martyrdom would have sent scampering from her ranks. In many quarters, not excepting some of the highest, the love of souls was superseded by a craving for personal advancement, even for pelf, and by all the grovelling motives which inspire the actions of the veriest worldling. A double wrong was thus done to religion, which is the life of the Church. The uncompromising opposition to worldly maxims and principles, which the Church cannot but proclaim, provoked the animosity of the world, whilst at the same time the worldly lives of many of her children, even of her clergy, provoked its scorn. How is it possible to overrate the loss of prestige and authority which she must have experienced in the exercise of her august office of universal teacher by this condition of things? "A house divided against itself cannot stand," said God Incarnate; but this is worse. This was a Church professing to teach men how to save their souls, which had the appearance of permitting, although in fact it was not so, some of her ministers to lead lives in utter violation of the principles she commissioned them to teach. If she were not what she claims to be, it is impossible that she should have survived a state of such fatal disorganization; and with such a miracle of supernatural preservation manifest to all, it is difficult to imagine how any one, who is not ignorant of it, can be irresponsible for rejecting her divine claims.

Out of evil comes good, out of darkness light, out of sorrow joy, out of sin and shame penitence and purification. This is according to the analogy of all God's dealings with his creatures. The tide ebbs and flows, the waves rise and fall, the life of spring succeeds the death of winter, light and morning arise over night and sleep.

The Church too, which is the light of the world, is not exempt from the general law. She too has her days of darkness and of sorrow, and her days of triumph and rejoicing. She carries her Master's cross to the four ends of the earth, the nations rejoice under her shadow and she sits a queen. Then comes the inevitable decadence, until some beneficent catastrophe, whose thunders shake the mountains, and whose lightnings leap from pinnacle to spire, cleanses the charged atmosphere of its corruption, and leaves behind at its subsidence the heavens clear, calm, and serene.

Such is the history of the spirit of evil within the Church, even within the sanctuary, which worked such havoc in God's heritage towards the close of the Middle Ages. The tornado of infidelity to which it gave birth, failed to extirpate it. It had taken too firm a hold to be driven out in a moment. A more striking judgment has at last, in our own days, swept the unclean thing from the sanctuary. Her worldly prestige has been rudely plucked from her, and she is the object of universal persecution. It may be in the designs of Providence that she should speedily resume her temporal dominion; but, if so, with how chastened a spirit? The old charity has been rekindled within her, the old martyr-spirit has revived, and never was there a time when she displayed a more perfect coherence, a more complete unity within herself and with her visible head, or a more fervent spirit of universal brotherhood, than now when the world is making a mock of her supposed senility, assaults her with its deadliest weapons, and gloats over her dissolution, which it fondly predicts.

Amongst the people of the earth the Romans were above all others distinguished by the spirit of justice with which they were animated. Their jurisprudence had obtained a high degree of perfection during the closing years of the Republic. The inflexibility of its administration varied throughout the imperial era according to the disposition and power of the reigning Cæsar. The principles of equity, liberty, and defence of the weak, which pervaded it, harmonized easily with the more exalted principles of Christian law. The Church found much in it which she could appropriate; and as her visible organization developed she did in fact embody a considerable portion of it in her jurisprudence. Had the Roman Empire remained in its integrity, the relations between the Supreme Head of the Church and the temporal sovereignty would perhaps have been adjusted with comparative ease. But the rise of new kingdoms and empires, with customs and laws differing among themselves as well as from those of the vanished empire, inaugurated a difficulty which has kept the sword, predicted by the divine Head of the Church, unsheathed throughout her subsequent history, and whose solution never appeared to be further off than in this day in which we write.

It is, however, chiefly the feudal customs of the Teutonic nations, joined to the indiscriminating spirit of those lovers of the sword, as we have already hinted, that we have to thank for a struggle that has worked such havoc in Christendom. When it was common for bishops to do homage to lay lords paramount for fiefs with which they were endowed, and for temporal superior lords to receive investiture from princes of the Church, it was easy for unlettered warriors, men unaccustomed to any habits of thought, but accustomed to have their own way, to confuse the secular barony with the ecclesiastical dignity; and, inasmuch as the succession to both invariably coincided, to confuse the two investitures, to muddle up the two jurisdictions. Those ignorant feudal barons, whose exaggerated reverence for physical prowess was only tamed by the graceful mutual subordination of lord and vassal, had on the whole but scant regard for a superiority not based on feats of arms. In their eyes the spiritual law disappeared in the temporal. The jurisdiction of the latter was present and sensible, that of the former was exercised in a sphere which their swords were not long enough to reach; and the very fact that the jurisdiction of the spiritual law availed itself of temporal weapons, itself caused the spiritual power to sink in the estimation of a multitude of feudal barons, who were prone to think more of my Lord Bishop than of the pastor of his flock. In such a state of things not only was it easy for a headstrong, irreligious, and strong-willed emperor or king to convince himself that, as lord paramount over all the fiefs in his dominions, the right of presentation to episcopal sees, indicated by the investiture of ring and crosier, was as much his as was that to the temporal baronies or counties that went with them; that the spiritual allegiance was as much his as the feudal, and that he was the source of all jurisdiction, whether ecclesiastical or civil, within the realm over which he held sway; nay, it was difficult not to fall into this fatal error. It is not rash to assert that, if it had not been for the formidable temporal sanctions which accompanied the sentence of excommunication, sanctions formidable enough occasionally to dispossess a powerful monarch of his throne, the spiritual power would have been subjected to the temporal to an extent most injurious to religion and the Church.

The seventy years' schism, during which a portion of Christendom rendered obedience to anti-Popes, seriously weakened the prestige of the faith; but it was not nearly so calamitous in its results as the union of the secular and ecclesiastical power[1] which

[1] Is it necessary to state that we do not here make any allusion to the union of these powers in the Vicar of Christ, which even a Protestant historian of the Popes acknowledges to be necessary to the free exercise of the authority of the common Father of the faithful?

characterized the feudal ages. The exaltation of the temporal authority at the expense of the spiritual, which necessarily resulted from it, was not the worst evil it inflicted on religion and the Church. Lay patrons, nobles, and princes, infected with this disregard of the spiritual jurisdiction, for the furtherance of their own private interests and ambitions, would thrust into vacant ecclesiastical dignities individuals the most unfitted for their office, whose worldly policy, and worse than worldly lives, scandalized religion and the faith.

It must be admitted that at the time when the unfortunate Augustinian monk entered upon a career which ended so tragically, there was abundant room for reformation. The corrupting influences flowing from the source we have indicated, had overspread the Church. Now, indeed, as at all periods of her history, there were men and women whose brows were adorned with the aureole of sanctity unknown to all but Him for whom they lived; but a number of the ecclesiastics, both of high and low degree, were far from illustrating in their lives that severe standard of Christian virtue which it was even more their duty to practice than to preach. The world, the flesh, and the devil had even gained entrance within the cloister, and men and women, bound by vows of Christian perfection, lived, many of them, in utter disregard of the rules which had been framed by the holy founders of their respective communities, for the regulation of lives which aimed at fulfilling the evangelical counsels.

The evil was widespread and pernicious. The general decadence of Christian virtue and of ecclesiastical discipline invited an evil even more destructive and more lasting, the venom, namely, of classicalism, which the returning Crusaders imported from the East. If the evil had been confined to an admiration of Plato and Aristotle, but little harm would have come of it. But when the world of letters became possessed of an admiration for classical productions in literature and art, as well as in speculative philosophy, amounting to a mania; when Christian poets aspired to sigh like Sappho, to chant their patriotism in Tyrtæan odes, to mould prosy epics in the sounding monotony of Virgilian verse, or, worse, to emulate the amatory or Bacchanalian melodies of Anacreontic sonnets; when images of pagan gods began to find their way back again into the Augustea; when the representations of pagan myths, pretty, many of them, in their conceptions in the times of heathen darkness, but monstrously ridiculous after the Christian revelation, decorated Christian churches; when, furthermore, those gorgeous models of architectural perfection, which soared far above the limits of mere æsthetic beauty, and carried the imagination aloft into the boundless and untraversed spheres of the sublime, were displaced by colossal Roman rotundas, whose beauty, if they had any, was

of the Amazonian type, and whose only sublimity consisted in their size, the whole Christian habit of thought was scandalized. It was an apostasy from true art as complete and as degrading as that subsequent one from the true faith, for which it prepared the way. The license of intellectual speculation and the pride of thought reappeared even within the sanctuary, and it seemed as if, after the lapse of fifteen centuries of spiritual enlightenment, the miserable times had come back again when the insoluble question was, "What is truth?" and the generation to whom the "preaching of the cross was foolishness."

The most striking and universal characteristic of the writings of the men who were mainly instrumental in bringing about the revolt from the Church in the sixteenth century, is their advertent and quite unscrupulous falsehood, chiefly in the form of calumny. Nothing more markedly indicates the demoniac agency at work; for what is the epithet by which the evil spirit is specially designated, but *o diabolos*, the slanderer? Even the works of other writers are filled with gross exaggerations, partly from misinformation, partly from an ill disposition towards religion. Modern research, animated by a nobler spirit of historic impartiality, has exposed much of the slanderous falsehood with which the so-called reformers distorted the testimony of history, and which their Protestant successors have so assiduously kept up. It requires, consequently, a great deal of patient investigation, and it is even then not easy to arrive at a just and accurate apprehension of the men and the times. Making all due allowance for this, however, we may perhaps admit that Alexander VI. was not a man whom it was edifying to see in the chair of St. Peter; that the court of Leo X., however much lustre it might have shed on the reign of an earthly sovereign, ill befitted that of a bishop laden with the care of all the churches; and that the character of that *dilettante* Pontiff, blameless as it was in point of morals, exhibited but a poor example of the evangelical virtues. It was not at the tomb of an apostle who was crucified with his head downwards, or of that other who "counted all things but dung" except the knowledge of Christ, that we should look for devotion to pagan learning, to pagan models of art and literature, or to pagan habits of thought; neither could it be a legitimate boast for a Christian Pontiff that he was a splendid patron of such things.

We have a right to regard the sack of Rome by a rabble of imperialists without a general, which followed close upon the heels of the *Renaissance*, as a scourge of God upon that unholy movement. Adrian VI., the successor of the *classic* Pope, was the very opposite of Leo. He was a very mirror of Christian virtue. He exhibited the saintliness of Christianity in all its majestic severity.

His whole soul recoiled from this resurrection of heathenism, and he set himself against it with all his might. But it is easier to engender an epidemic, especially a moral one, than to extirpate it; and the revival of pagan tastes and pagan forms, which was contemporaneous with the so-called reformation, has poisoned the streams of literature and of art, and has emasculated in many quarters the Christian faith up to the days in which we live. The devil never forged a weapon against the Church which met with more signal success. It exasperated the evil which had given but too real cause for the cry for reformation. The political complications of the Holy See, the tempers and dispositions of some of its Pontiffs, and the temporal grandeur of the Church throughout the world, infected the very life-current of the Church with the venom of worldliness. It is true that the position of the Vicar of Christ as a temporal monarch threw upon him the necessity of adopting a course of state policy and political intrigue quite repugnant to our ideal of the supernatural policy of a Christian bishop. The three great European powers were contending for influence in Italy. Had any one of them overwhelmed the others it would have brought Italy, including Rome, under its subjection, and would have endeavored to make the Church the vassal of the State. It cannot be urged against the Popes that they made this position for themselves. Two hundred and sixty-two Popes in eighteen hundred and seventy years—an average, that is, of one Pope in every seven years—chosen from every nation and every class of life, of different tastes, dispositions, principles, national predilections, and family connections, could not by any possibility have given any uniform direction to political events throughout that period of time. All alike saw the necessity of preserving the Church from subjection to any of the kingdoms of this world; all alike adopted the means which seemed the best calculated to effect this object in the particular crisis of political events in which they chanced to find themselves.

When Pontiffs such as Julius II., Alexander VI., and others, devoted themselves with great earnestness to founding powerful principalities within the domains of the Church and elsewhere in Italy for their nearest relatives, the commonest charity obliges us to believe that they were as much actuated by that motive as by the desire of promoting the secular interests of their families, if the former was not indeed the actually leading and guiding one. Such a charitable interpretation of their motives is confirmed by the circumstance, that this policy was never adopted before the great Powers which had grown up in Europe began systematically to invade the spiritual prerogatives of the Church. Be this as it may, the actual result was that the Church had come to wear an exterior

of worldliness, not at all in harmony with that enmity to the world, the flesh, and the devil, which is at the root of all her teaching. It could not but be that, in proportion as this was the case, her spiritual influence should decline; and this evil would be the more fatal in places where people were brought into the closest contact with it, that is, in places of highest rule and dignity in the Church. In happier times, the resurrection of Greek and Roman literature, effected by the Crusaders, and the invention of printing, would have run no risk of giving birth to so unchristian a movement, and so unenlightened a one as that to which has been given the name of the *Renaissance*. As it was, it found a congenial spirit ready to receive it, and to make the worst of it. At the time when Luther went to Rome, infidelity had begun to rear its head snakelike in the very sanctuary. Had Luther been a saint, even a spiritually-minded man, and had he effected a real reformation within the Church, she would have blessed him from her altars until the second coming; but the spirit of the world took possession, too, of the proud man, and of his work. He was a scourge instead of a blessing. Not one of the persecuting Roman Emperors, not Alaric the Goth, nor Attila the Hun, nor even Arius himself, worked such widespread havoc among human souls as has the unfortunate Augustinian. It does not appear to have been the design of Almighty God that any single man should work a reformation of His Church. What the saintly Adrian could not accomplish was not likely to be accomplished by a coarse and conceited monk. The only real reformation was inaugurated by the Council of Trent. But reformation, when the evil has acquired the force of habit, is a slow process. The reformation by the Tridentine Council has been going on ever since. Like almost all solid reformation it has been unpretentious, gradual, and noiseless. The world had the Church fairly in her clutches. It cost her a long struggle to disengage herself.

Some score of years after the Coucil of Trent, the metropolis of Christendom was in a deplorable condition from a special cause. A kind of clannish warfare had established itself in the very heart of the Italian peninsula. The varying fortunes of rival princely families, between whom there seemed to exist an eternal feud, had given rise to a kind of noble banditti, who were restrained from no crimes by the warnings of religion, whose lawless violence it required something more than the ordinary patriarchal gentleness of the Papal government to repress.

The influence of these men, who had relations, generally, at the Roman court, occasioned a spirit of lawlessness in the city itself. Murders were of constant occurrence. A general laxity of morals prevailed, except perhaps amongst the humble classes, and the task

of bringing powerful criminals to justice seemed almost hopeless. The state of Rome, at that time, is thus described in a MS. Life of Sixtus V., in the Altieri library:

"Bands of outlaws and assassins were associated for violence, murder, and robbery, under certain chiefs distinguished for their crimes and cruelties. The followers of these men were valued according to their audacity and guilt; the worst criminals, and those who had perpetrated the most horrible outrages, were the most extolled, receiving titles, and, after the manner of soldiers, made decurions or centurions. They infested the fields and roads, not as highwaymen but as men who had right on their side.

"At length they lent out their services for money, slaughtering the enemies of those who hired them, deflowering virgins, and committing other iniquities from which the soul recoils, ever ready to commit crimes for those who needed and could pay for their reckless assistance.

"This state of things was openly tolerated by the great and nobles. For numbers of them, either overwhelmed by debts, induced by ambition or love of pleasure to exceed their means, or led on to deeds of cruelty and violence by quarrels and revenge, afforded their patronage to robbers, and even entered into league with them, hiring their services to do murder, in return for impunity and shelter. When it became known who was the patron of the several assassins, the sufferer from their violence complained to this kind of patron. Under the pretence of mediating he plundered both, sharing their prey with the brigands, and taking a reward from those who sought his help, though making a show of refunding it. There were not even wanting men who contrived attacks on merchants and rich persons, on their sons, their estates, or other possessions, and then sold their services to the aggrieved for the ransom of that which had been taken, pretending to so much compassion for that disaster, that they might have been believed to pity the sufferers from their hearts.

"Throughout the cities factions were established, each distinguished by the head-dress, or manner of wearing the hair. There were many who, to confirm their hold on the party they had adopted, killed their wives that they might marry the daughters, sisters, or other kinswomen of those with whom they desired to be leagued. Others slew the husbands of their kinswomen, either secretly or openly, that they might give the widows in marriage to those of their league. It was, at that time, a common thing for a man to obtain any woman to wife whose beauty or riches had pleased him, by the mediation of some noble, even though her kindred were unwilling; nor did it rarely happen that highborn and very rich men were compelled to give their daughters in marriage with large dowries to most abject outlaws, and men living by rapine, or to join themselves in marriage with the undowered daughters of those brigands. The most abandoned men constituted the tribunals, announced their courts, arrogated judicial power, called the accused before them, urged witnesses to testify against them, extorted evidence by tortures, and finally passed sentence in regular form; or they would try those who had been thrown into prison by the lawful magistrate, have the cause of such pleaded before them by attorney, then acquitting them, would condemn their accusers and judges in the penalties of the *lex talionis*. If the accused were present, immediate execution followed the sentence; if the decree was against the absent, no other delay was permitted than that needful for dispatching the ministers of crime, with orders written and formally sealed, who inflicted with grievous reality what had been determined in mockery of law. There were many who called themselves lords and kings of such provinces as they chose, not even dispensing with the solemnities of inauguration. . . . More than once, when they had plundered the churches of their sacred furniture, they bore the most revered and most holy Eucharist into the woods and haunts of robbers, there to desecrate it for the most execrable uses of wicked magic. The indulgent government of Gregory made bad worse. The great multitude of the outlaws easily furnished a large amount of bribes from their plunder to the servants of the government, who connived at their proceedings, or only made a show of disapproving them. Then, those

who would petition for an amnesty received that security, others took it of their own authority; nay, there were many of them appointed to command fortresses, towns, and soldiers. These, like men returning from some great action, were lauded wherever they went by the multitude who poured forth to behold them."

A single incident will serve to illustrate the pitch of lawlessness to which affairs had come in Rome at this period. When a pardon was offered to a bandit named Marion Mazzo, he would not accept it, declaring that his life "was more secure while remaining an outlaw, to say nothing of the increased advantage." It does not in the least detract from the virtue, strength of character, or administrative capacity of Gregory XIII. that he was unable to stem such a flood of iniquity. We have no blame, but much compassion, for the aged Pope, when lying on his deathbed he stretches his hands to heaven and exclaims almost prophetically: "Thou wilt arise, O Lord, and have mercy upon Sion!"

Such was the state of things in the midst of which Felice Peretti, Cardinal Montalto was called to occupy St. Peter's chair! There was perhaps not another man throughout the four quarters of the globe who could have confronted such a crisis. He met it with unbending will and unquailing heart. He drove the robber-barons from their fastnesses, the gangs of outlaws from their haunts, and hanged their chiefs. "While I live," he said the very day after his coronation to the friends of four young men who, having been taken with weapons on their persons forbidden to be carried by the law, had taken occasion of so auspicious an event to intercede for their lives, "every criminal must die." On that same day the unfortunate youths were hanging on one gallows near the bridge of St. Angelo. Of him it may be truly said, if of any human judge, he had no respect of persons. It mattered nothing to him to what station of life a criminal belonged, he would hang a prince with as much indifference as he would a peasant. If during his short but vigorous reign, the attribute of mercy seemed to be somewhat lacking, and justice appeared in more than all the awful sternness of her most inflexible impartiality, it was because the state of affairs imperiously demanded it. By no gentler means could the healthy action of the body politic be restored.

The followers of the false prophet had successfully accomplished the feat which had been in vain attempted in long ages past by the hosts of a mighty Persian sovereign. They had crossed the Hellespont and were sweeping across Eastern Europe on their way to Rome. Amongst the refugees from Sclavonia who fled before the advancing scourge, and betook themselves into Italy was Zanetto Peretti. He settled at Montalto. Fortune did not smile upon the family. A descendant, Peretto Peretti, the father of

Sixtus, became involved in debt and found it convenient to leave Montalto. Peretto must have been either a very unthrifty or a very unfortunate man. He was always in debt. Hiding from one's creditors is not a lovely life. The unlucky Peretto had to visit his new-born child on a foggy night to escape the dangers of a creditorial ambush. Grimly must they have smiled when, animated by some strange instinct of the child's future greatness, he offered to satisfy their claims by a kiss of its foot. "I hold in my hands," he said, "a future Pope."

He betook himself to Fermo at Grotto-a-Mare, and cultivated a garden belonging to Ludovico Vecchio, whose housekeeper, Diana, engaged his wife to assist her in the domestic duties. It was here that the future Pope was born. He was the last of four children. From the midst of poverty and rigid severity of domestic discipline, emerged the robust character which was to shed lustre on the Papal See, and to change the metropolis of Christendom into a city of peace, piety, and prosperity. Such was his father's poverty that he could not pay six cents a month for the boy's schooling; and when the Franciscan brother, who had taken a fancy to the little fellow's bright and ready wit, undertook to pay for his schooling, his dinner consisted of a slice of bread which he ate by the side of a stream, whose waters supplied him with drink. At an early age he continued to earn a pittance by herding swine. It was amidst circumstances so adverse and unpropitious that Peretto had given to his infant son the name of Felix; and this not from any family reasons, nor to place him under the protection of the Saint of that name, but under the impulse of a definite conviction that the child in his arms was to become the greatest of men. We lay no stress whatever upon his belief that this fact was announced to his wife by a heavenly voice, however credible the authority on which it comes down to us. Remembering that humility is the foundation of all Christian virtue, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that such a bait to human ambition could have been offered by any heavenly intimation. It is certain, however, that from whatever cause, both father and mother had from the birth of Felix a strong presentiment of his future greatness. And it communicated itself to the lad; for when at the age of twelve years he entered the Franciscan order, he retained as his name in religion the significant name that his father had given to him at his baptism.

The austerity of his mother's discipline must have contributed as much as the discipline of poverty to the formation of the strong character which was to do so much for Rome, religion, and the Holy See. A manuscript biography of him in the Vatican library relates of this period of his life, "Through fear of his mother, when

he thought he had done anything wrong he trembled from head to foot."

The presentiment which a supposed heavenly voice had initiated had begun to work. Already the child Peretti had evidently resolved to earn the name which had been imposed upon him at baptism. It is not improbable that his young ambition already stretched towards St. Peter's chair. Certain it is, that he soon exhausted the humble literary resources of the village school. Whilst the other boys romped and played, the little Felix studied and learned. His progress was so rapid that the worthy pedagogue was fairly out of breath. His consternation drove him to a strange logical process. "Here is this lad," he urged, "getting as much learning in one day as his schoolfellows do in a month! Is he only to pay the same as they?" And so he demanded six cents a month for so promising a pupil. But, by this time, we must suppose that the young swineherd could have taught his master, and he was transferred to the higher teaching of the convent school.

The austerity of the Franciscan rule kept up, no doubt, the healthy effect upon his character of his mother's severity, and of the hard discipline of poverty.

It is remarkable, yet it is almost universally true, that there seems to be almost a slumber of the spiritual instincts between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five or thereabouts. Happy they who have the advantage of the protection of monastic discipline during this perilous period of their life. It was a period devoted by the young Peretti to study. He studied at the universities of Ferrara and Bologna. His studies were crowned with brilliant success. An edition of the works of Aristotle and Averroes was amongst its first fruits. His theological proficiency and dialectical skill were early manifested. His success in a literary tournament in Perugia, where he discomfited Antonio Persico, a celebrated Perugian professor, at the age of twenty-eight, drew upon him the notice of Cardinal Carpi, who was the protector of his order. He had already become famous as a preacher. On one occasion he was stopped by the people of a town in which he had been preaching, and not allowed to depart until he had preached to them three more sermons. At thirty years of age he was appointed Lent preacher at the Church of the Holy Apostles in Rome. During a pause in one of these Lenten discourses, he espied a sealed packet on the pulpit desk. Opening it, "Thou liest," several times repeated, met his gaze. Examining it further, he found various statements of doctrine quoted from his previous sermons, to every one of which these somewhat rough words were appended. Arriving at home, he dispatched the packet to the Inquisition. It was not long before there entered his cell a man whose "stern brow, deepset eyes, and

strongly-marked features," caused him a slight emotion of terror. It was Michele Ghislieri, the Grand Inquisitor! But he found in Fra Peretti no waverer in the faith, no *fautor* of new views and heterodox opinions. He found a man full of faith, and of the soundest theological learning. Then the inflexible guardian of the integrity of the Christian faith became the tenderest of parents. He embraced with tears the son whom he had come to judge, and became his second patron. He was only thirty-eight years of age at the death of Paul IV., yet his opinion was already sought for by the heads of the Church on questions of moment. An incident of the kind brought him the acquaintance of that Pope. A church had been burnt, the Host had remained uninjured. The matter was referred to the calm deliberation of an assembly of cardinals, inquisitors, generals of orders, and others. Cardinal Carpi brought thither his favorite Peretti, and insisted upon his opinion being heard. It was assented to by all, to the great content of the Cardinal, who with pardonable complacency exclaimed, "I know the man I have brought hither." Within ten years, namely from 1548 to 1559, he was charged with no less than ten disciplinary commissions to different houses of his Order. In the year 1560 he was made Inquisitor Apostolic for Venetian territory, and also assistant theologian to the Inquisition in Rome.

A true reformer must have the courage and fortitude of a martyr. The few saintly souls are his supporters; the rest are either his embittered enemies, or frown upon his zeal with suspicion and discouragement. The intrepid character of the man was not lost either upon the rulers of the Church nor those of his own Order. Wherever the restoration of discipline required uncompromising firmness, he was selected to effect it. His vigorous administration in Venice brought upon him so much odium that his life was not safe there. His own brethren accused him before the Council of Ten, and he was obliged to return to Rome, where he was made Consultor of the Inquisition.

Pius V. had appointed him Vicar-General of his Order, investing him at the same time with a commission to execute a complete reformation of it. The commission could not have been trusted to abler or more vigorous hands. Without respect of persons he abolished instantaneously all the irregularities that had gradually encroached upon the rules and constitution of the Order. He deposed the Commissaries General and replaced their authority in the proper hands of the Provincials. The rigor of his visitations, and the completeness of his reform, even surpassed the expectations of the Pope; but it brought him into a nest of hornets, who would have stung him to death if they could. It is possible that,

in a man of his temperament, his conscientiousness and vigor were not equalled by his urbanity. It might, perhaps, have been better if a little more of the *suaviter in modo* had accompanied the *fortiter in re.* Anyway, so exasperated against him were his brethren in Religion that it required the intervention of Cardinal Carpi to effect his reception into the monastery at Rome. Envy pursued him even into his monastic cell. It was whispered to the Pope, Pius V., that the pious favorite of Cardinals Carpi and Ghislieri had fitted up his cell with princely sumptuousness, that he was living in luxury little befitting his vocation, and that four huge chests securely fastened had been recently conveyed into his apartment. Pius V. was not the Pope to allow himself to be prejudiced against an illustrious ecclesiastic by unsubstantiated rumor.

Great was the astonishment of the Bishop of St. Agatho—for to that See had Peretti been promoted—when one day the Pope demanded admission to his cell. His holiness found bare walls, scant furniture, and no appearance of luxury; but, sure enough, there were the mysterious chests. "And what treasure there so carefully guarded?" asked the Pope, pointing to the chests, shrewdly guessing perhaps how matters stood. "Books, Holy Father, books!" replied Peretti, as he opened one of the chests, pleased no doubt with the interest taken in his humble affairs by the holy Pontiff, and quite unconscious of the calumny he was dissipating, "which I am going to take with me to St. Agatha." The satisfaction of the Pope may be conjectured. The envy of Peretti's enemies brought him the cardinal's hat. That was the reply of Pius V. to the good bishop's detractors. This happened in 1570.

The fifteen years of his cardinalate contain no incidents of sufficient importance to be commemorated in this rapid historical survey. We find the man of vigor and of action, upon whose uncompromising courage and unbending firmness duty at present made no further calls, leading the retired and tranquil life of a dignified ecclesiastic, doing acts of beneficence to his native town and its environs—from which he had some time before assumed the name of Montalto—discharging the duties of a good bishop, and enriching the Church by his literary labors. He published in 1580 an edition of the works of St. Ambrose. His harmless recreation consisted in adorning the gardens of St. Maria Maggiore. One incident, however, illustrates in so pleasing a manner at once his charity and greatness of soul, that it cannot be passed over in silence. When Pope, the unsparing severity with which he executed justice upon offenders when he himself was not personally concerned, seemed at times to border upon cruelty. That there

was nothing of cruelty in his disposition is evinced by the incident we are about to relate.

When his nephew, Francisco Peretti, whom his uncle's prospect of mounting the papal throne had enabled to make a powerful matrimonial alliance, was assassinated, it was at his earnest intercession with the Pope that the investigation was discontinued. The strange presentiment of the poverty-stricken Peretto Peretti was strangely fulfilled. The little infant to whom at the baptismal font his father, then in the deepest depths of his indigence, in the full confidence of his future exaltation, had given the name of Felix, had moved steadily along the path of honor. He was now sixty-four years of age, and was about to reach a summit of dignity beyond which there is none to mortals. On the 25th of April, 1585, he was placed in the chair of St. Peter, head of Christ's Church on earth.

The history of the conclave by which he was elected, does not enter into the plan of this short historical essay. Only a surface reading of the history of the papacy is sufficient to convince any mind, not darkened by free-thinking and heresy, of the direct interposition of the Holy Spirit in these elections.

It has not comported with the divine counsels in the regeneration of mankind in the Church, that a dignity higher than all earthly pre-eminence, such as is that of the Vicar of Christ, should be free from the rivalry of human ambition and the competition of worldly motives. The details of the history of some of these conclaves are almost repulsive. The influence brought to bear upon them by powerful monarchs, the complicated and almost unscrupulous intrigues, the *egotistical* combinations, the bargaining of self-interest, the ingenious manœuvring, contain not even a suggestion of the working of the Holy Spirit of God; but withal these are the functions of His Church at every step. The electors are shut out as far as possible from communication with the outer world. The aid and inspiration of the Holy Spirit are invoked daily. The great sacrifice of propitiation is offered, and the food which strengtheneth men's souls is partaken of by those who are to choose the successor of St. Peter. The universal result is, the astutest combinations, the most cunningly-contrived intrigues, the most powerful worldly influences, come to nought; it seems as if they were made a mock of by God, and invariably there appears on the papal throne the man exactly suited for the time and the occasion. Sometimes the direct intervention of the Holy Spirit is manifested in almost a miraculous manner. The compiler of the "Conclavi de pontifici Romani quali si sono potuto trovare fin a questo giorno," dated 1667, has the following: "It is here rendered manifest that the most secret, disguised, and astute negotiations, etc., by the secret

operations of heaven, are made vain, and result in effects altogether different from those contemplated." The Venetian Ambassador, Lorenzo Priuli, on his return from Rome after the conclave, in his report to the College at Venice distinctly states his belief that the election of Sixtus V. was miraculous, and the result of the immediate interposition of the Holy Spirit.

No sooner did the erst swineherd, then humble Franciscan monk, find himself in the place of supreme government on earth, than the real character of the man, which had been maturing amidst such stupendous difficulties, manifested itself in all its grandeur. The resolute vigor with which he braced himself up for his high task, seemed to communicate itself to his physical frame. He seemed to have grown two palms taller, says one of the historians of the conclave. The story of his assumed senility, which disappeared at the moment of his election, is an invention of Leti. The only foundation for it is the very natural fact that, when called from a condition of comparative retirement to the discharge of the most tremendous responsibilities known on earth, under circumstances so perilous and so critical as to demand a courage and endurance no less than heroic, his body answered to the demands of his robust soul, and was reinvigorated for its task.

As Visitor of his Order, as Consultor of the Inquisition, as himself Inquisitor, and in the execution of various commissions intrusted to him, the new Pope had exhibited himself as an inflexible and impartial disciplinarian. There was nothing in his disposition of the cruelty or arrogance which those whom his disciplinary conscientiousness had made his enemies, ascribed to him. Ranke himself, the Lutheran historian of the modern papacy, relates that his "rules and regulations" were characterized by a "mild, conciliatory, and indulgent" spirit.

It could not escape the keen glance of a man so eminently righteous that religion and the Holy See were suffering, not so much from defective laws or for any want of virtue or piety in the reigning Pontiffs, as from a timid administration of the laws, too much consideration for worldly rank and power, and too paternal condescension to evils that seemed inevitable. He saw the position in a moment, and resolved to do his duty in it. It was time for justice to draw her terrible sword, and criminals, of whatever class, must be made to feel that it would inevitably strike them. "The administration of justice," he said, in a speech in the Consistory at the commencement of his reign, "and to secure abundance for his people, would be his chief care; to these he had resolved to devote himself, trusting that God would send him legions of angels if his own strength and the aid of others sufficed not to punish the male-

factors and reprobates, and he exhorted the cardinals not to use their privileges for the shelter of criminals."

The way had been prepared for the advent of such a Pope as Sixtus V. The scourge of small cords had been driving the money-changers out of the sanctuary. Under the reigns of his immediate predecessors the Holy Spirit had been slowly but gradually dispossessing the spirit of the world. The month's reign of the devout Marcellus had kindled in the minds of all men who wished well for religion and the Church the most enthusiastic hopes. The vigorous administration of the majestic Paul IV. had given a prodigious impulse to the reformation so much demanded. Even the somewhat easy temper of Pius IV. was caught by the flame of devotion that had been enkindled. The Council of Trent made the reformation permanent. Then came the saintly Pius V. to insist on the rigorous execution of the decrees of the reforming Council, and to set an example of it in his own unblemished life.

Under Pius IV. nepotism, hitherto the bane of the Roman Curia, had disappeared. Under Pius V. municipal independence which, from special causes, had become the nurse of anarchy and tyranny, instead of liberty, became merged in the central authority. It had been the custom of the Popes to appoint relatives or fellow countrymen to the several governments within the States of the Church, who ruled through the instrumentality of that curse of all government whatever, middle-men. Pius V., himself, appointed the acting governors; and the surplus revenues resulting from so important a change he threw into the treasury. The same Pope disbanded the whole standing army, with the exception of about five hundred men, whom he had retained at Rome.

Such sweeping reforms as these were never effected without a certain amount of discontent. The old Guelph and Ghibelline feud broke out under the Pontificate of the successor of Pius, Gregory XIII., surnamed the vigilant, and the States of the Church became a prey to banditti.

There was therefore at this time a twofold aspect of the state of things in the city of Rome. Of the one, and more pleasing, aspect, a life of Sixtus V., by Pietro Galesino, in the Vatican library quoted by Ranke, gives a most favorable description. "The discipline of the clergy is almost restored to the most holy standard of primitive manners. The regulation of divine worship and the administration of the holy temples are altogether brought back to the approved model of old times. . . . Everywhere within the Churches are genuflections; everywhere almost throughout the whole city are to be found those of the faithful, who on Good Friday so severely lacerate their own backs with numberless wounds that even the

blood flows down upon the earth." The other aspect is the one we have described above.

The gentle and paternal rule of the Roman Pontiffs was not fitted to struggle with such an evil. An iron will and unfaltering hand were needed for its extirpation. Sixtus V. brought both to his task. Not only did he visit the smallest infraction of the law, by whomsoever, with unbending severity, yielding to no intercessions however powerful or however touching, but his measures were dictated by so much skill and prudence, that his efforts in behalf of law and order were crowned with almost miraculous success. Two or three examples will be sufficient to show the extraordinary severity with which he administered justice. A young nobleman who insulted a maiden by embracing her in the streets, was hung in spite of all the efforts of his family to procure the commutation of the sentence. A youth was condemned to death for resisting the Sbirri. A member of one of the first families in Bologna was strangled in prison and his estates confiscated, for having connived at some of the excesses of the banditti. The price which the laws had placed on the head of an outlaw he required to be paid by the family of the criminal, or, if they could not pay it, by his commune. When a celebrated bandit sent a defiance to him from a gate of the city, he commanded his family to produce him, or suffer death themselves. In less than a month the bravo had lost his head.

He decreed that the noble, or commune, within whose jurisdiction any of the outrages of these banditti had been committed, should make good the loss sustained thereby. To any bandit who should deliver up a comrade living or dead, he promised a pardon for himself, as well as for any companion he might name, together with a reward in money.

The success of his measures was complete. The Venetian Ambassador Priuli writes: "The new brief has caused the banditti to fall upon each other. A year had not passed when the two last leaders of the bandits suffered the penalty of their crimes." Gualterius, in his Life of Sixtus V., thus describes the happy result of his energetic policy: "Such peace and tranquillity prevail, that in this great city, in this assembly of nations, in so great a mingling of strangers and visitors, where haughty nobles display so much power, no one is so mean, no one of so humble estate as now to feel that he can be subjected with impunity to any wrong or injury whatsoever."

That the unbending sternness of Sixtus in the punishment of criminals was rendered necessary by the state of things, and did not arise from any element of cruelty in his disposition, is shown by the conciliatory character of his general policy. To the bandit

nobles he was implacable. No matter how high the quarry, he soared higher, and struck it without mercy. The rest of the nobility he propitiated in every way. By the wisest and justest measures he reconciled their differences and conciliated their support. The old feud between the Colonna and the Orsini he appeased by matrimonial alliances. To the head of the house of Colonna he gave a grand-niece in marriage, to the head of the Orsini another. He enriched both with an equal dower, and he made age the arbiter of precedence.

He was equally conciliatory in his foreign policy. His predecessor had deprived the Milanese of their place in the Rota. He restored them. The Congregation which took cognizance of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in foreign countries he suppressed. This union of a spirit of conciliation with severity in the administration of justice, produced the happiest results. The King of Spain ordered the executive in Naples and Milan to treat the Papal decrees with the same respect as his own. Tuscany and Venice no longer afforded a shelter to the banditti.

This remarkable Pontiff exhibited as much vigor in the administration of the other affairs of the State as in the vindication of the law. Nothing was so insignificant as to escape his observation, nothing so great as to abash his efforts. His native village of Montalto he raised to the rank of an episcopal city, and founded a college of Montalto in the University of Bologna. Of Loretto too, where was the Holy House, in spite of what seemed to be insuperable difficulties, he made a city. The universities were reformed. The administration of the several communes was inquired into, and the most energetic steps were taken for restoring their prosperity and importance. The Orvieto swamp and the Pontine marshes were drained. To encourage the manufacture of silk, mulberry trees were ordered to be planted throughout the States of the Church wherever the land was not devoted to the cultivation of corn. To the encouragement of woollen manufactures, he devoted earnest attention, "in order that the poor might have some means of earning their bread." He brought water to the city from a distance of twenty-two miles, through aqueducts rivalling in size and extent those of ancient Rome. He created six Congregations expressly for the control of secular departments of internal administration. Of those whom he appointed to the Cardinalate he required that they should be "men of true distinction, of most exemplary morals, whose words should be oracles, their whole conduct and example being a model and rule of life and faith to all who behold them: the salt of the earth, a light set upon a candlestick."

Under such a ruler religion and the city alike revived. The

population of the latter increased from seventy to a hundred thousand.

Its hills were again clothed in magnificent buildings, and it was nearly doubled in extent. With a faith as unbending as his will, he swept away the hideous pagan symbolism with which the *Renaissance* had defaced Christian architecture. The immense difficulty of the work did not deter him from having the obelisk surmounted with the cross placed in front of St. Peter's. On the columns of Antonine and Trajan he placed the statues of St. Peter and St. Paul. For the spear in the hand of the statue of Minerva he substituted a cross.

From Gregory XIII. he inherited an exhausted treasury; yet so successful was his administration of the finances that he increased the revenue by three thousand dollars, and at his death left a million in the Castle of St. Angelo, dedicated to the Holy Virgin Mother of God, and to the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, which he forbade his successors to use, if they would avoid the wrath of Almighty God, or to employ for any other than one of the six following purposes: A war undertaken for the conquest of the Holy Land, or for a general campaign against the Turks; the relief of famine or pestilence; the succor of any province of Catholic Christendom which is in manifest danger; to repel any hostile invasion of the Ecclesiastical States; or to recover a city belonging to the Papal See.

The religious aspect of the Curia, and of the city itself, more than kept pace with its temporal prosperity, and science and learning kept pace with religion. The religious reformation had begun before the time of Sixtus. Ten years before, it had been written: "Several Pontiffs in succession have been men of blameless lives, and this has contributed immeasurably to the welfare of the Church; for all other men have become better, or at least have assumed the appearance of being so. Cardinals and Prelates attend Mass diligently. Their households are careful to avoid whatever might give offence. The whole city has indeed put off its former recklessness of manner. People are all much more Christianlike in life and habit than they formerly were. It may even be safely affirmed, that in matters of religion Rome is not far from as high a degree of perfection as human nature is permitted to attain."

The crying evil, however, remained unredressed. Disrespect of law was affected by people in high places, and increased to an extent which threatened to quench the remarkable religious revival and ecclesiastical reformation of which the Holy See itself had of late set so brilliant an example. The fitful severity and equally fitful indulgence of Gregory XIII. were unequal to its correction. The vigorous arm of Sixtus crushed it almost at a stroke. Nothing

now was left to impair the religious movement. The appointments of the Pope to ecclesiastical dignities were regulated not by any consideration of a personal nature, but by the high standard I have above described. The personal habits of the Pontiff afforded a shining example of self-denial and of devotion to duty. The following description of it is given by a contemporary (*Sixti V. Pontificis Maximi vita a Guido Gualterio Langenesino descripta*, MS. of the Altieri library): "Most sparing of food, and very temperate in sleep; never seen idle, but even when at leisure ever meditating either of study or business." Again. "Although he referred affairs to the Congregations and others, he yet always had cognizance of all himself, and took part in the execution. With great zeal did he investigate the proceedings of all the magistrates, whether in the city or the provinces; likewise the conduct of all others who had rule throughout the Apostolic See."

Is it wonderful that under such a Pope we find religion glorified and promoted by such men as St. Philip Neri, Charles Borromeo, Salviati, Santasevirina, Maffei, Mantica, Clavius Muret, Azpilcueta, Baronius, Maintca, Arigone, Valiere, Bellarmine, Frederick Borromeo, and a multitude of others little less distinguished for piety and learning? It is a great tribute to the memory of Sixtus that the spirits of evil could not constrain their rage when this strong will was no longer there to curb them. The criminals whom he had kept in awe during his lifetime rushed out into the streets when he had breathed his last, and tore down the statues that had been erected in his earlier days.

If such wonders could be effected during a pontificate of four years, what might we not have expected, had the life of Sixtus been prolonged to a more advanced age? Such was not the will of God.

The new life which had been infused into the Church by the Council of Trent, had grown so rapidly under Pius V. and Gregory XIII., and under Sixtus V. had displayed itself in almost primitive youth and vigor, was not to be one of those sudden transformations which are, nearly always, as transient as they are rapid. It is only in our own time that a reformation so auspiciously begun has manifested itself in all its strength and completeness, when Germany and Switzerland, and indeed all parts of the earth, are populous with confessors; and it only waits for "him who letteth to be taken out of the way," for it to be seen that the Church is as prolific of martyrs as she was when the populace clamored for Christians, and the lions roared for their prey.

SOCIALISTIC COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES.

WHEN thirty years ago the storm of revolution swept through Europe, overturning thrones and shaking to their foundations the most firmly established governments, its movements were watched in this country in a like spirit to that in which meteorologists note the course of intertropical cyclones, and study the atmospheric and the glacial phenomena reported by explorers of polar regions. It was not supposed that the time should ever come when the people of the United States would have to confront socialistic movements as portentous facts actually existing in their own midst.

True, there had been previous to 1848, and there have been since that year memorable in European history, sporadic efforts to exemplify practically the Arcadian paradise which socialistic philosophers confidently predict will follow universal acquiescence in their notions. Attempts were made at Brook Farm and some other points to actualize the ideas of socialism under their most refined form. Speaking of the Brook Farm experiment some years after it had been abandoned, one of those who had been zealously engaged in it said:

"It was an honest and well-meant effort to combine such industrial, social, and educational arrangements as would promote economy, combine leisure for study with healthful and honest toil, avert collisions of caste, diffuse courtesy, and sanctify life as a whole. We had stept down from the pulpit; we had thrown aside the pen; we had shut up the ledger; we had thrown off that sweet, bewitching, enervating indolence which is better, after all, than most of the enjoyments within mortal grasp. It was our purpose—a generous one certainly, and absurd, no doubt, in full proportion with its generosity—to give whatever we had heretofore attained for the sake of showing mankind a life governed by other than the false and cruel principles on which human society has all along been based.

"And, first of all, we had divorced ourselves from pride, and were striving to supply its place with familiar love. We meant to lessen the laboring man's great burden of toil by performing our due share of it at the cost of our own thews and sinews. We sought our profit by mutual aid, instead of wresting it with strong hand from our enemy, or filching it craftily from those less shrewd than ourselves, if indeed there were any such in New England, or winning it by selfish competition with a neighbor. . . . And as the basis of our institution, we proposed to offer up the honest toil of our bodies as a prayer, no less than an effort, for the advancement of our race.

"We were of all creeds and opinions, and generally tolerant of all on every imaginable subject. Our bond, it seems to me, was not affirmative but negative. We had individually found one thing or another to quarrel with in our past life, and were pretty well agreed as to the inexpediency of lumbering along with the old system any further.

"As to what was to be substituted, there was much less unanimity. We did not greatly care, at least I never did, for the written constitution under which our millennium had commenced. My hope was that between theory and practice a true and available mode of life might be struck out."

An admiring visitor at Brook Farm soon after the undertaking was commenced, and evidently an enthusiastic believer in it, thus describes it:

"Everybody works and studies, and so the children work and study from imitation and in spirit. Teachers, scholars, all work. As all eat together, they change their dress for their meals; and so after tea they are all ready for grouping in the parlors, or in the library, or in the music-room; or they can go to their private rooms or into the woods. . . . I do not seem to myself to have told you a moiety of the good which I saw. I have only indicated some of it. But is it not enough to justify me in saying they have succeeded? . . . Only in America, I think, could such a community have so succeeded as I have described, composed of persons coming by chance, as it were, from all circumstances of life, and united only by a common idea. . . . They have succeeded because they are the children of a government, the ideal of which is the same as their own, although as a mass we are unconscious of it, so little do we understand our high vocation and act up to it."

The experiment was made under conditions the most favorable to success, if it had been possible for it to succeed under any conditions. It was made by men of the highest moral character and honesty of purpose, possessed of, or able to command, ample pecuniary means for procuring whatever they deemed necessary to success, men of the highest order of intelligence and intellectual and social culture. Yet it quickly "came to grief." The amiable philanthropists who committed themselves to this sublimated socialistic scheme soon tired of the realities that confronted them in their attempts to carry their ideas into practical effect. The poet, who sang in mellifluous verse the delights of strolling at early dawn over dewy meads, found it quite another thing to wade at break of day through dank grass to his farm work. The metaphysician soon became disgusted with his task of feeding pigs, and the chemist of sweating over a churn in vain efforts to make "the butter come."

Then another disappointment, they soon found, was in store for them. The few Hodges and Pollies whom they induced to unite with them in forming their socialistic Arcadia, could not be persuaded to join with any hearty appreciation in the intellectual exercises with which toil on the farm and work in the house were intermingled. They could not listen, or, if they did, it was with unmistakable signs of weariness, to the philosophic discourses and the poetic rhapsodies with which it was sought to furnish relaxation and refined pleasure after the day's labors had ended. Their thoughts remained obstinately wedded to their horses and ploughs, their milk-pans, their brushes and brooms; or, if they went beyond, they were fixed upon subjects entirely too utilitarian and commonplace to form any bond of union or sympathy with their more intellectual associates.

Personal piques, too, personal likes and dislikes, jealousy, and

wrangling invaded this philosopher's paradise. Every one had some fault to find either with the underlying ideas of the scheme or with the manner in which those ideas were attempted to be practically carried out. The enterprise could not be made self-supporting—a patent, practical condemnation of the whole experiment—and it was soon abandoned in disgust.

But we will let one who was himself a member of the Association,[1] and who mourned over its failure, tell in his own way the story of its ending:

"While our enterprise lay all in theory, we had pleased ourselves with delectable visions of the spiritualization of labor. It was to be our form of prayer and ceremonial of worship. Each stroke of the hoe was to uncover some aromatic root of wisdom heretofore hidden from the sun. Pausing in the field to let the wind exhale the moisture from our foreheads, we were to look upwards and catch glimpses into the far-off soul of truth. It is very true that sometimes, casually gazing around me out of the midst of my toil, I used to discern a richer picturesqueness in the visible scene of earth and sky. But this was all. The clods of earth, which we so constantly belabored and turned over, were never etherealized into thought. Our thoughts, on the contrary, were fast becoming cloddish. Our labor symbolized nothing, and left us mentally sluggish in the dusk of evening. Intellectual exercise is incompatible with any large amount of bodily labor. The yeoman and the scholar—the yeoman and the man of finest moral culture, though not the man of sturdiest sense and integrity—are two distinct individuals, and can never be melted or welded into one substance.

. . . "The experiment so far as its original projectors were concerned, proved, long ago, a failure; first lapsing into Fourierism, and dying, as it well deserved, for this infidelity to its own higher spirit. Where once we toiled with our whole hopeful hearts, the town-paupers, aged, nerveless, and disconsolate, creep sluggishly a-field. Alas! what faith is required to bear up against such results of generous effort. . . . In my own behalf I rejoice that I once could think better of the world's improvability than it deserved. It is a mistake into which men seldom fall twice in a lifetime; or, if so, the rarer and higher is the nature that can thus magnanimously persist in error."

In these last two sentences the writer we have just quoted furnishes the clue to the fundamental error of the whole undertaking. The "mistake" was in supposing that the troubles and miseries of life arise from causes entirely external to poor human nature. The members of the Brook Farm Association "had individually," as Mr. Hawthorne says, "found one thing or another to quarrel with in their past lives." Yet, strange to say, or rather not at all strange, for this seems to be a common method with humanitarian philosophers and reformers, they never thought that the right thing for them to do would be first to set themselves right; they at once conceived the idea of "improving the world." Human nature, according to their theory, was in itself all that it needed to be; all that was required was to remove certain obstacles external to itself, obstacles that stood in the way of its peaceful, harmonious culture and development. That done, "a higher life" could at once be

[1] Hawthorne.

realized than that which is "governed by the false and cruel principles on which human society has all along been based."

At bottom, therefore, notwithstanding all the æsthetic features of the scheme, and the amiable spirit which seemingly animated it, it aimed at the destruction of society as it has always existed, and at its total reconstruction or, rather, re-creation. The Brook Farm experiment was therefore in perfect harmony with the fundamental idea of socialism, which is that human society is, and ever and always has been, based on principles that are "false and cruel;" that the evil which is in the world, and the cause of its misery, has its seat not in the heart of man, but is generated by the structure of society; that society, therefore, must be overturned from its lowest foundation, that it is the mission of socialism to do this, and then to re-create society, and so to organize it that the existence of evil and its invariable consequence and concomitant, misery, shall be impossible.

It was not our purpose at the outset to examine in detail the Brook Farm undertaking. We intended simply referring to it as one among many socialistic attempts in the United States to realize, under one form or another, "a higher mode of life" than is supposed to be possible under the existing structure of society. Contrary to this intention we have dwelt upon it at greater length, because it was one of the best in form and intention, if not the best, that has been made; it was conceived in the most amiable and philanthropic spirit, and it was most free from the ideas of wild revolution and positive hatred of Christianity, that characterize the general socialistic movement.

Many other attempts to realize socialistic principles have been made in the United States. Some of these have aimed at little more than the establishment of the communistic idea of property, and have become in actual fact simply a number of individuals or families holding the property with which they started, the subsequent results of their labor, and all their accumulations, in common, they themselves being supported out of the common fund. Of these some quickly failed; others still continue self-sustaining, and in a few instances more than self-sustaining. But in the few instances in which these societies have increased in material prosperity, the increase has not been so great as would have resulted from a like amount of economy, thrift, and labor, practiced by the same number of persons working independently. Nor has the practical result of these societies been such as tends to make converts to their ideas. The workmen whom they hire, and the people who live around them, have never manifested any desire to join these communities. Their life is quiet and free from the sources of anxiety and from many of the vicissitudes and sudden changes in-

cident to life in society, but it is dull, monotonous, and unbearable by most persons; it is unintellectual, unæsthetic, and at best little more than that of a man who yields up his own will, surrenders his personal freedom, for nothing more than the assurance of always having enough to eat, sufficient clothing, and a house to shelter him. Passing over the many utter failures, the few that have succeeded in keeping together and becoming self-supporting, as "The Harmony Society," "The Separatists at Zoar," "The Amana Society" in Iowa, and some other communistic associations, they represent, even from a purely humanitarian point of view, a dull, unprogressive, ungraceful type of life, with no noble aspirations or aims, no sense, seemingly, of the higher powers and capabilities of human nature, and no provisions or influences tending to develop them. It is an equable, calm life, but motionless; the calmness is that of stagnation, of an existence which is quiet because no consciousness of an exalted destiny fills the soul with serious purpose and high resolve, and impels its possessor to earnest, unceasing action. You look in vain among these societies for intellectual, highly-educated, refined men and women. They are entirely utilitarian. Art is unknown among them. Beauty and grace are not only not appreciated, but despised. Instrumental music is not allowed by some of them, and the vocal music that exists among them is generally of the simplest character. Some of them oppose the cultivation of flowers, and denounce a liking for them as sinful. In their buildings they care nothing for architectural effect. Only a few of them have libraries, and where they have them they are extremely limited, both as regards the number of books and the range of subjects. Science in all its higher developments is utterly neglected.

Some of these communistic associations adopted the principle of celibacy; others allowed their members to marry, but required them to eat at a common table, and as far as possible to live together in community, the children being cared for in a common nursery; while still others permitted the several families to occupy separate dwellings.

Very different in several respects from these associations, yet having in common with them the idea of separating from society, were the attempts to carry out the "free-love principle" under different forms and in different ways. Prominent among these is that of the "Perfectionists" at Oneida, New York, who professedly hold that community of goods and persons is taught in the New Testament;[1] but however loose have become the ideas and practice of

[1] They avowedly hold that "within the limits of the community membership, any man or any woman may cohabit, having first gained each other's consent, and they strongly discourage as "sinful selfishness" what they call "exclusive and idolatrous

the people of the United States in regard to the divine obligation of the sixth commandment, they have not yet fallen to that depth, that they are prepared publicly and formally to attempt its abrogation.

Before tracing other attempts in the United States to exemplify the fundamental assumption of socialism, that society is based upon principles that are essentially "false and cruel;" that those, therefore, who wish to escape from the operation of these principles must separate from society; and that in order that the human race may realize its destiny, human society as it has always existed must be destroyed, and with it all the institutions which it has always comprehended, we remark that there is nothing new in the idea or practice of holding property in common, and nothing new in the idea of a life of celibacy, both of which were prominent features in the experiments to which we have referred.

The first converts to Christianity at Jerusalem threw their property into a common fund, but they did so under no feeling of hostility to human society, nor with any idea that their action should have the force of a universal law. They did it in the first fervor of their faith and charity, as an exceptional and temporary arrangement, suitable and proper under the circumstances then existing. It was not adopted by the Christians at Damascus, Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, Thessalonica, or Rome, and it soon came to an end even at Jerusalem.

So, too, it is well known that both the holding of property in common and the state of celibacy were practiced by those of the early Christians who aspired to a higher life, and they both have continued to be practiced through all ages down to the present time by members of the Religious Orders of the Church. But in all these cases it is done with no intention of making war upon society, of destroying it with a view to re-creating it or substituting something else in its place, or imposing their mode of life as a rule upon all mankind. The motives that impel Catholic Religious to enter the monastic state are not natural but supernatural; they are grounded in the desire to follow the Evangelical Counsels, which our Saviour did not impose as a command upon all who should become His followers, but left free to be adopted only by those to whom the vocation would be specially given, and, along with that vocation, strength to enable them, in the spirit of special self-abnegation, to make the sacrifice and bear the yoke which Christ knew all persons could not endure.

---

attachment of two persons for each other." Yet even among them the necessity for some limit to their horrible system of polyandry and polygamy has become so manifest that certain rules have been enacted for its regulation.

Hence it is that communism, as exemplified in the history of the Religious Orders of the Church, contrasts so broadly, and in such marked way, with all actualizations of it, or rather attempts at actualizing it, in the world. Hence it is that through the power of the supernatural motives inspiring the members of Catholic Religious Orders, and despite the natural influences that otherwise would have affected them, they have not become motionless, inactive, as invariably is the case with those who separate themselves from society and attempt this life without supernatural motives and special grace; that the Catholic Religious do not look with indifference, contempt, or hatred, upon those who live in the world; that, on the contrary, they are filled with the warmest impulses of true charity for mankind, deeply interested in all that may better the condition of men and alleviate their miseries; and that, whether as regards industrial improvements, intellectual advancement, the perfection of human legislation and government, progress in letters, the development of science, art, social culture, and of all that is noble, graceful, and beautiful in human life, the Catholic Religious, though not of the world, yet have been, and are, its greatest benefactors.

But this argues nothing in favor of socialistic communism, which is based upon humanitarian ideas, which looks only to this world, which strives to shut out from view the principles of divine obligation and duty upon which human society rests, and which makes constant war against Christianity and the Church. On the contrary, it condemns the socialistic scheme, proves its impracticability and its wickedness, as attempting to make possible on natural principles what is only attainable on supernatural, and as undertaking to make universal that which our divine Lord determined should only be exceptional.

Socialistic philosophers feel this, for there is nothing they hate so much as the Church, and nothing in the Church which they so much malign as its Religious Orders.

The various attempts to exemplify socialism in the United States, to which we have referred, were seemingly without effect upon the public mind. They, at most, numbered but a few thousand persons, separated into little communities, not counting in any instance more than two or three hundred members, and in many instances not more than twenty or thirty. They involved most divergent and contradictory ideas, and in no case commended themselves by their practical working to the better sense of the American people. Yet it would be a mistake to suppose that the ideas which their founders and supporters put forth did not take hold upon the American mind. Their leading notion, that society was all wrong, and that if it could be set right and reconstructed, the antagonisms

which afflict mankind, and the miseries growing out of those antagonisms, would all disappear, made numerous converts. Protestantism, protesting against what had been one of its dominating errors, the total depravity and corruption of human nature, and the cold, stern, rigid Calvinism which is the logical result of this error, swung over to the opposite extreme, denying the positive existence of sin as an inherent element in fallen humanity, and the need of divine grace to regenerate it. The Protestants of the United States fell speedily into this error, even where they professedly held to their Calvinistic creeds. In New England this was especially the case, and New England was the centre of intellectual light to the whole United States. Humanitarianism became the prevalent religion. The development of humanity by means of its own powers and capacities was the grand idea. The causes of evil were all external to our nature. "Excelsior" was the cry. With more perfect social arrangements man would improve, advance, develop, mount upwards, and soar into the empyrean.

Our newspapers took up the idea, first timidly, then more boldly The New York *Tribune* notably became the special advocate of the new gospel, and for some years its columns were crowded with expositions of the way and manner and means by which earth was to be turned into an industrial paradise; toil to be supplanted by "attractive labor;" the tyranny of capital terminated forever, so that there would be neither rich nor poor; but by the organization and maintenance of phalansteries, first in this country and then all over the earth, human activity and energy under every form would be made to work in perfect harmony, and universal prosperity, contentment, and peace would reign from pole to pole. Other organs, though less ably conducted than the *Tribune*, were established for the special propagation of these ideas, and its and their articles were extensively copied and republished even in newspapers which did not commit themselves to the new doctrine.

The theory met with abundance of ridicule and opposition, it is true, yet the opposition and ridicule often helped rather than retarded its diffusion, for in very many instances those who undertook to oppose it, accepted its fundamental error as true, while they combated its consequences and found fault with the details of the schemes through which its realization was expected.

The advocates of this socialistic gospel, of which the New York *Tribune* was a prominent organ, did not confine themselves to the propagation merely of the theory. Attempts were made to demonstrate its feasibility in a practical way, and to show by results actually achieved the advantages that would accrue to mankind from its universal adoption. Associations were formed on a limited scale, which were to prove that if men were everywhere gathered into

phalansteries, all these forming parts of a universal organization, it would be possible for the brain-worker and the laborer who toiled with muscle and sinew, the student and the stupid drudge, the skilled mechanic and the awkward botch, the physician, the artist, the chemist, the metaphysician, the merchant, the clerk, the sailor, bricklayer, farmer, carpenter, miner, tailor, shoemaker, hod-carrier, and men of all trades, occupations, and pursuits, and of all tastes, habits and characters, to unite together sweetly and peacefully in this new social creation, and work for a common livelihood and the common good.

Woman, of course, was not overlooked in this grand scheme. She was to be relieved from her domestic duties; her social wrongs were all to be righted; she was to be emancipated, elevated to a position of *equality* with man by having the same occupations that he engaged in all thrown open to her. She was to have the right of suffrage; she was to be eligible to the bar, the bench, the Legislature, and to Congress; to the Gubernatorial and the Presidential chair. We do not know that it was very strenuously insisted that she ought to be allowed to quarry stones or work in a rolling mill, to enlist as a private soldier or marine, but we remember quite distinctly reading an article in the *Tribune*, in which her superior qualifications for acting as captain of a Hudson River steamboat were set forth at length, on the ground that the captain's chief occupation was to look after the comfort of the passengers, and that a woman therefore was peculiarly fitted for the position, because of her superior natural quickness, tact, and consideration for the feelings of others.

The practical efforts to actualize these ideas, however, made no progress. The associations that were formed to carry them out would not work smoothly. The sweet, perfect harmony which it was predicted they would bring about was never realized within the experimental associations. On the contrary they became the very embodiment of *dis*harmony; and, in some instances, ended in a regular *row* among the members. The *Tribune* itself, the great exponent of the new gospel, could not be conducted on the principles it advocated. The Tribune Association, organized as a step towards the practical realization of those principles, became in fact simply a joint stock company. Fanny Wright's intended demonstration of the feasibility of socialistic ideas on a cotton plantation cultivated by negroes who were to work out their own emancipation by earning the amounts paid to their previous masters, ended in an utter failure. And in every form and shape in which it was attempted to exemplify practically socialistic communism, the attempt proved entirely unsuccessful.

Then the cry was raised, "Our ideas are all right, but our efforts

to realize them practically are premature. Men are not yet prepared to adopt them; they have been too long accustomed to the old ways and habits of society to abandon them in a day; these habits have become a second nature to them. We must prepare mankind for the radical change in their traditionary ideas, in their habits and modes of life, in their entire character, which the adoption of our system requires. Men must be educated out of their old life, and into the new life of communism. The present generation is intractable. We must look to the next generation, take hold of the young, enlighten and educate them, before socialism can obtain universal acceptance among mankind. We must have one common system of education for the children of all classes, the rich and the poor, the high and the low."

The common-school system was thus to be made the grand instrumentality for the propagation of socialistic ideas,[1] and it has been

---

1 This is no supposititious charge. The late Dr. O. A. Brownson, who was heart and soul, at that time, with the originators of the common school system in the United States, and who was perfectly acquainted with their intentions and purposes, in a work published in 1857, entitled "The Convert, or Leaves from my Experience," giving a history of his opinions, makes the following statements:

"The negro experiment having failed Fanny Wright enlarged her views, and discovered that the United States were not as yet prepared to engage in earnest for the abolition of slavery, that the whites were as much slaves as the blacks, and that negro slavery was only a branch of the huge tree of evil which overshadowed the whole land. There was little wisdom in wasting one's time and resources in the attempt to lop it off while the tree itself was left standing. The axe must be laid at the root of the tree, and slavery must be abolished only as the result of a general emancipation of and a radical reform of the American people themselves.

"The first step to be taken was to arouse the American mind to a sense of its rights and dignity, to emancipate it from superstition, from its subjection to the clergy, and its fear of unseen powers—to withdraw it from the contemplation of the stars or an imaginary heaven after death, and fix it on the great and glorious work of promoting man's earthly well-being. The second step was by political action to get it adopted at the earliest practicable moment, a system of State schools, in which all the children from two years old and upward should be fed, clothed, in a word, maintained, instructed, and educated at public expense.

. . . "The great measure on which Fanny Wright and her friends relied for ultimate success was the system of public schools. . . . These schools were intended to *deprive*, as well as to relieve, parents of all care and responsibility of their children after a year or two years of age. It was assumed that parents were in general incompetent to train up their children in the way they should go, to form them with the right sort of characters, tempers, and aims, and therefore it was proposed that the State should take the whole charge of the children, provide proper establishments, and teachers and governors for them, till they should reach the age of majority. This would liberate the parents and secure the principal advantages of a community of goods.

"The aim was, on the one hand, to relieve marriage of its burdens and to remove the principal reasons for making it indissoluble; and, on the other, to provide for bringing up all children in a rational manner, to be reasonable men and women, that is, free from superstition, from all belief in God and immortality, or regard for the invisible, and to make them look upon this life as their only life, this earth as their only home, and the promotion of their earthly interests and enjoyments as their only end. The three great

energetically and effectively employed in that way. Socialism has not been professedly taught in our public schools, yet its fundamental ideas have been inculcated in them, and their practical influence has told powerfully in the diffusion of those ideas.

It needs but a glance through the favorite text-books for exercises in reading and declamation in our common schools, particularly those in use some fifteen and twenty years ago, for we are glad to say that they have improved somewhat in late years, to convince any one of the entire truth of the charge we here bring against the common school system. Those text-books were filled with extracts, beautiful in style, subtle and eloquent in argument, from the writings of New England rationalists and transcendentalists, in which man himself was set forth as the supreme object of worship, the ideal of human life. The highest acme of human aspiration was the development of human nature, not in the Christian sense, but in one that entirely ignored Christianity. The future life, if not denied, was referred to only in so vague and shadowy a way as to suggest the thought that it was nothing more after all than a beautiful dream, the creation of imagination, projecting into the future mere fancies suggested by the realities of the present life.

The true purpose of our existence was itself, and that purpose was to be attained by the perfect unfolding of our natural capacities and powers. For that, humanity was self-sufficient. Thus all need of divine grace, of divine assistance, was put out of view.

---

enemies to worldly happiness were held to be religion, marriage or family, and private property. Once get rid of these three institutions, and we may hope soon to realize our earthly paradise. . . .

. . . "The more immediate work was to get our system of schools adopted. To this end it was proposed to organize the whole Union secretly, very much on the plan of the Carbonari of Europe, of whom at that time I knew nothing. The members of this secret society were to avail themselves of all the means in their power, each in his own locality, to form public opinion in favor of education by the State at the public expense, and to get such men elected to the legislatures as would be likely to favor our purposes. How far the secret organization extended I do not know, but I do know that a considerable portion of the State of New York was organized, for I was myself one of the agents for organizing it. . . .

"Our next step, and in connection with this, was the formation of what was known as the Working Men's Party, started in Philadelphia in 1828, and in New York in the year following. This party was devised and started principally by Robert Dale Owen, Robert S. Jennings, George H. Evans, and a few others. . . . The purpose in the formation of this party was to get control of the political power of the State, so as to be able to use it for establishing our system of public schools. We hoped by linking our cause with the ultra democratic sentiment of the country, which had from the time of Jefferson and Tom Paine something of an anti-Christian character, by professing ourselves the bold and uncompromising champions of equality, and a deep sympathy with the laborer, . . . and by keeping the more unpopular features of our plan as far in the background as possible, to enlist the majority of the American people under the banner of the Working Men's Party; nothing doubting that if we could once raise that party to power, we could use it to secure the adoption of our educational system."

No limits to human capability were recognized. The capacities and powers of our nature were susceptible of infinite development. The circumstances that surrounded the individual, growing out of his social position and surroundings, often interposed obstacles to that development. Therefore they must be persistently fought with and surmounted.

The idea that there was anything providential in the individual's circumstances and position was ignored, and the profound Christian philosophy of St. Paul: "I have learned in whatsoever state I am therewith to be content," had no place in this common-school literature. Had any one advocated it as a rule of life he would have very quickly acquired the reputation of being behind the age, a reactionist. In fact, our common-school literature and the whole traditionary influence that surrounds the pupils while attending those schools, inculcate the principle not of content but of constant discontent. There is no recognition of providential circumstances as pointing out or directing our course in life; the idea inculcated is that the individual must keep up a constant fight with his surroundings and circumstances. Unlimited aspiration, inordinate ambition to rise above his condition, unrestrained longings for what he does not possess, is the practical lesson constantly taught in our public schools. Social status, social surroundings and circumstances are the great obstacle to the realization of these longings and ambitious desires; therefore society comes to be looked upon not as the state in which by the laws of his own being as well as the teachings of divine revelation the individual is intended to exist, but as the great obstacle to his progress in realizing his destiny.

Then, too, the natural equality of all men is another doctrine that enters largely into our common-school literature. Inequality, it is often more than hinted, is the result of social maladjustments and partiality, society lavishing its favors on some, imposing burdens on others. These causes of inequality should not exist; they must be removed. In other words, society must be destroyed and then reconstructed, re-created.

Thus our common-school system has been sowing the seeds of socialistic communism in the minds of the young. The leading ideas of its literature are in perfect harmony, though expressed in polished phrase and with subtle circumlocution, with those of Mr. Justus Schwab and other outspoken revolutionists of the reddest hue, who employ plainer and ruder words. That these ideas have taken root and borne fruit after their own kind, any one may easily convince himself by glancing over the essays and addresses delivered by graduates of the public-school system at their exhibitions and commencements; and not unfrequently too in the addresses which

the principals of our public normal and high schools from time to time deliver.

But though the seeds of socialism were thus, in years not long past, scattered broadcast upon a soil prepared to receive them, and though in the form of speculative ideas they found ready entrance into the minds of a great portion of the people of the United States, yet they lay seemingly dormant. The conditions favorable to their vigorous germination and appearance above the surface were not present. Most persons who held them as parts of their philosophy, felt that, however desirable it might be in the distant future, when the United States should have become overcrowded with a population struggling in fierce competition for the bare necessaries of life, to "organize labor," and re-create society after the fashion proposed, yet that that time had not quite arrived. The greater portion of our country was still unoccupied. Even in our longest-settled States forests were to be felled and farms opened out. The exhaustless soil of prairies had scarcely felt the plough. Our coal and iron ore had scarcely been touched by the miner's pick. Cities were springing up as if by magic, each requiring thousands of mechanics and laborers to build it. Our manufactories were scant of operatives. There was work for every one who wanted work, and at good wages. As for capital, the universal feeling was that we had not enough; that more capital in this country meant more work, and higher pay, and better times for workingmen. Thus, the general feeling was, with those who had unconsciously become converts to one or another of the ideas of the socialistic philosophy, that however true socialism might be in theory, the time had not as yet come to carry it out in practice in these United States.

The anti-slavery excitement then took almost exclusive possession of the public mind, and that was followed by the war to which it gave rise, between our Northern and Southern States. After the war followed a short period of abnormal industrial activity to replace the waste of property which it caused, whilst the destruction of human life which it involved had lessened the number of workmen, and kept up the prices that had been paid for labor during the continuance of hostilities. The high wages received by workingmen and laborers led them into a more expensive, and in some instances an extravagant mode of life; it created artificial wants, and accustomed many to regard the gratification of those wants as an actual necessity. The disbanding of our immense armies threw upon the country vast numbers of persons who had become demoralized, who had lost the habit of regular industry, and could not brook a life of humble toil and economy.

Meanwhile French and German infidels have been flocking into the United States, deeply imbued with revolutionary socialism.

It is the fashion among our newspapers to attribute the sudden exhibition of socialistic communism to these foreigners. It is unquestionably true that to them is due its open expression in its wildest, rudest form; but they have simply enunciated the logical practical consequences of the socialistic theory. The seeds of socialism have long been germinating and taking root in our soil; and now that pinching poverty, actual destitution, and want of the barest necessities of life have come upon so many thousands of workingmen, the fierce fire of passion engendered by this deplorable condition, has only hastened the growth of what was heretofore beneath the surface, and caused it to spring more rapidly into visible open existence.

The people of the United States may well look at home for the most potent causes of the prevalence of socialist notions among themselves. Our whole popular political philosophy is permeated with these ideas. Our common-school literature, our non-Catholic pulpit discourses not unfrequently, and our Fourth of July harrangues, almost without exception, set forth in unqualified terms the equality of all men, not their equality before God, but their unconditioned, absolute, natural equality as regards this world, and the self-sufficiency of human nature in the exercise of its natural capacities, unassisted by divine grace, and independent of any divinely established relations, to determine and work out its destiny. Our legislatures and courts are actively and most effectively engaged in the same bad work. The easy dissolution of the marriage tie, the constant effort to rule out of legislatures and courts all recognition of religion and of divine authority as the basis of human government, and other acts and features which characterize the whole movement of society in the United States, may be pointed to as furnishing ample ground for the charge we here make. It must be remembered that ideas which seem harmless when put forth in merely philosophic form and as speculative theories, and which, as held by persons in comfortable circumstances entirely satisfied with their present social status, are entertained only as dreams which they never expect will be realized, nevertheless gravitate downwards. They gradually reach others less speculative and more practical than themselves, less contented with their social position and condition. They at last find lodgment in the minds of the idle, the lazy, the rude, the dishonest, the reckless, the scheming adventurer and demagogue, of those who are suffering for want of the bare necessities of existence, who have nothing to lose, and hope they may possibly gain, from whatever changes or convulsions society may undergo; and in their minds these ideas take their logical, practical form in the cry, "Bread or blood," "Down with capitalists, down with the laws that protect

them;" in the form of open defiance of government and indiscriminate destruction of property.

Our leading newspapers are energetically engaged in belittling the socialistic movement, and endeavoring to check its manifestations by ridicule and intimidation. They are telling the men who are its ostensible leaders, who, after all, are nothing more than adventurers less shrewd and more reckless than others who keep themselves in the background, that the people are prepared to put down by force attacks upon property and attempts to institute a reign of license in the United States. Yet the very ideas these newspapers constantly enunciate, hostile to religion, recognizing no divine basis of human society, no source of authority in law and government other than the mutual consent of men, no divine sanctions for individual property, for the marriage relation, for parental authority and for filial obedience—these ideas which form the staple of our newspaper and periodical literature, of our most popular political essay writers and orators, lie at the very root of socialism, and foster the growth of socialistic notions. Thus almost the entire influence and power of American literature is, consciously or unconsciously, on the side of the socialistic movement.

The movement has become an actually existing fact, and a fact, too, of more dire portent than is commonly believed. We had evidences of this last summer in the reluctance of our State troops to put down the lawless men that took possession of our railroads, and the still more lawless persons that stood at their backs and supported them. The difficulty in promptly bringing the law to bear, did not arise merely, or mainly, as our newspapers would have us suppose, from want of discipline, or habits of military obedience on the part of our citizen soldiers, or from inability to quickly concentrate troops at points where their presence was required. It was caused chiefly, we are well convinced, by a feeling of sympathy with the rioters, though not with the destructive means and way in which the rioters sought to accomplish their purposes.

Socialism exists in our midst. Let us look at it fairly and squarely, and see what it is. We will state the theory in the form of a series of propositions, every one of which is to be found in the writings of one or another of those who have devoted themselves to the philosophic elaboration of the system.

1. Capital systematically oppresses labor. It draws to itself an exorbitant portion of the results attained by the combined employment of labor and capital, enabling the capitalist to live in luxury, compelling the laborer to drag out a dreary existence on what is barely sufficient for physical sustenance, and very often not even sufficient for that. The laborer has certain natural desires, as much so as the capitalist, and an equal right with him

to gratify those desires. Society as it is now organized, and everywhere and always has been, keeps the laborer in a condition of hopeless dependence, virtual slavery. It cuts him off from all ordinary possibility of improving his condition. This is the rule. The few instances in which the laborer has been able to escape from this condition of dependence are exceptional and prove the general prevalence of the rule. This unjust state of things is entailed upon the offspring of the laborer who, shut out by poverty and the oppression of capital from all ordinary opportunities of bettering his condition, is doomed to continue in like slavish dependence. Thus classes and castes in society are perpetuated, and the gulf that separates the rich and the poor, those who possess and employ capital and those who furnish labor, is widened and deepened.

2. Government is always and everywhere on the side of capital; capital grasping its reins, and shaping its legislation and wielding its power; as time goes on, the process of giving all to capital and doling out a pittance to labor is confirmed, and the oppression of labor is intensified. All the forces of advancing civilization under the present structure of society are monopolized by capital, and directed to the increase of its power to aggrandize itself and crush labor down into a condition of complete subjection.

3. Hence, it is the height of folly to depend upon political changes, upon alterations in the forms of government, upon the abrogation of certain laws and the enactment of others, upon legislation at all, for the release of labor from its bondage and its elevation to the position it ought to occupy; government, in fact, is nothing else than the organized action of the present structure of society, exerted continually for the protection of capital against the demands of labor, and for repressing all attempts on the part of the friends of labor to deliver it from bondage. This is the case even where governments are popular in form, and the right of suffrage is most widely extended. Even under so-called republican or popular governments, labor has really no rights, and laborers but the shadow of power. The extension of the right of suffrage to the people, of choosing their own legislators, executive officers, and judges, is a sham, under which laborers are deluded with a mere show of influence, whilst in reality it is all possessed and wielded by capitalists. It is capital that controls popular elections whenever it chooses, by persuasion, bribes, intimidation, or compulsion, openly or secretly, directly or indirectly exerted. Capital overcomes and shapes legislation, fills the minds of judges and jurors with its own subtle influence, paralyzes the executive arm when it is raised to repress the oppression of capital, and gives it tenfold weight when it strikes down the laborer.

4. This constant oppression of labor springs from the recognition of the so-called right of property; from the factitious sacredness attached to individual possessions. All existing governments, and all governments that ever have existed, are and have been thus radically wrong. The evil does not depend upon their form, inasmuch as whatever their form is, or has been, they all recognize to a greater or less extent the so-called right of property, and they ever and invariably have done so. The evil is inherent in the very structure of government, and cannot be eradicated. The only remedy therefore is to destroy all governments utterly, to sweep them, one and all, from the face of the earth.

5. Along with the overthrow of government there must be a total new creation of society. The present structure of society presupposes government as a necessary condition to its existence and presupposes government, too, as resting upon a basis of authority which is above the individual; as resting upon certain principles of right and wrong, which are mere abstractions, and which have no existence in fact, though most pernicious in their effects, as leading men to submit to authority, and thus allow tyranny to perpetuate itself. Right and wrong are merely conventional ideas, having no existence outside the notions of men; their only actual basis is nothing else than universal consent.

6. In order thus to re-create society, all existing social institutions must be swept away; those institutions being nothing more than means by which the social structure existing in all ages and in every country has perpetuated itself. Therefore, they are obstacles in the way of the proposed social re-creation, and must be abolished.

7. As the first condition to this social re-creation, the existence of individual property must be destroyed, and the very possibility of the individual acquiring property must be prevented; every one should have an equal and common right to what is called property, and an equal and common right to its enjoyment, it being but the common result of the toil and skill of all.

8. The family relations, also, must be destroyed, because where they are permitted, and the affections, desires, ambitions, and aspirations which spring from those relations are allowed to exert the influence which they universally do exert wherever and whenever they exist, men invariably seek, for the sake of their wives and children, to accumulate property, and are, and always will be, more interested in those who are united to them by family ties than in the common prosperity.

9. The relation of husband and wife has no sanctity or perpetuity; this is a false and pernicious notion tending to narrow and limit the interests and affections of men and women, eliminating from their minds the fact of the universal brotherhood of mankind, concentrating their thoughts and energies in the family to the detriment of wider interests, and, in fact, introducing within the commune an *imperium in imperio.*

10. The only difference in the relations of man to man and man to woman is that which grows out of sexual desire; this should be left entirely free to individual gratification, or, if at all limited, should be limited only by the rules of the universal brotherhood or commune with a view to the promotion of the common prosperity.

11. Parents have no right of personal control or authority over their children, and no right to direct their education. The children are the future commune; upon their training and education depend the future prosperity of the commune, the promotion of its interests, its harmonious and normal advancement, growth, and development. The children, therefore, belong to the commune, which, from a regard both for them and for its own perpetuation and well being, should take charge of and regulate their education.

12. From a regard for these and other considerations the parental relation must be abolished. The feelings which its toleration promotes both in parents and children, with the fancied obligations, duties, and rights to which those feelings give rise, tend to concentrate in the family circle affections and desires that are antagonistic to the common interest, to foster ideas of exclusiveness, and to strengthen the false notion of individual property. They interfere in every way with the normal idea of community of interests, and hinder the harmonious interplay and action of the principles on which the commune is based.

13. The Church has ever been the firmest support of government, of the idea of individual right in property, and of the family relation. The Church, consequently, is the greatest and most persistent obstacle in the way of the new social creation and, therefore, must be destroyed. The doctrines and principles of Christianity as long as they have power over the minds of men, will prevent the establishment of the new social creation. Therefore they must be totally eradicated, as not only false and delusive but as positive and most pernicious errors.

14. What has been said of Christianity holds good of every religion, to a greater or less extent, that recognizes any basis of duty outside of humanity itself; any authority, or source of authority, above man; and that inculcates belief in a future existence. For the recognition of duty, obligation, authority, in aught else but the community of all men, weakens the individual's respect for that community and interferes with the supremacy of its authority and the freedom of its action.

15. Belief in a future state of existence, in like manner, is not only a delusion but a positive hindrance to the common interests. For it tends, in proportion to its hold upon the individual, to make him contented with his present situation, inclines him to bear patiently the evils from which he suffers, under the idea that they are but of temporary duration, and that ultimately he may be compensated in another world for all that he has to endure in this world. This world is the world in which man lives; in which he must do all his work, and obtain all his enjoyment; consequently, delusive dreams of happiness after death, limit his present desires, interfere with his present action, and hinder the full expansion and development of his energies, capacities, and powers.

This is the gospel of socialistic communism stripped of rhetorical disguises and reduced to its fundamental propositions. We think that we have not misrepresented it on a single point, nor distorted nor discolored it in the least. Every one of the propositions we have stated may be found insisted on in the writings of the leading expounders of its philosophy. The only objection which upholders of communistic theories can make to our method of statement, is that it is too dispassionate, too cold, and naked; in other words, that it is too correct and exact. The truth is, socialism, when stripped of the verbiage and extravagant philanthropic phrases, the meretricious rhetoric in which its advocates robe it, cannot endure inspection. It is a system which sets common sense at defiance, outrages all the instincts of that humanity in whose name it wages war with the very institutions, which man has, everywhere and always, found it impossible to do without and yet live in a state of society—institutions to which man owes whatever of civilization and all its attendant influences for good, for advancement towards a higher condition, and for the development of the higher capabilities of his nature, he has ever enjoyed, or can enjoy. Socialism, if it were possible to actualize it, would crush out all the higher aspirations of humanity, reduce man to a mere machine, render progress, development, culture, and all that is properly included in them, utterly impossible. It is

"Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum."

We would not be understood as saying that *all* socialists hold in theory *all* the propositions in which we have summed up their philosophy. Many of them in Europe do not, and still more of them in the United States do not. It is only the most *advanced*, the most consistent and logical, those only who have the courage of their opinions, who start from the beginning and going right straight through to the end of this gospel of the devil, that hold the system in all its parts and with all its consequences.

The great majority of persons are not close thinkers, and this, to say the least, is quite as true of those who are infected with socialistic principles, as it is of others. The majority of socialists do not trouble themselves about the logical relations of the ideas they hold, or their logical consequences. Yet these, in fact, determine the practical effect of all ideas. The greater number of persons who are in sympathy with socialism, who look upon it as the means by which all existing antagonisms in society will be reconciled, the grand panacea for all the ills that afflict mankind, do not concern themselves with the system as a whole. Their thoughts are occupied with one or another of the evils, real or fancied, that exist in society, and instead of tracing those evils to their actual cause, they

at once saddle them upon "the false and cruel principles on which," as they allege, "human society has all along been based?" They have "each found one thing or another to quarrel with in their past life" or present condition, and instead of examining to see whether the fault has not been their own, they at once jump to the conclusion that society is all wrong, and insist upon "the inexpediency of lumbering along with the old system any further." Others of them are still partially under the influence of that tradition of divine truth which finds lodgment in the minds and moulds the thoughts, even of men who do not acknowledge it, and in very many instances are not aware of it.

Many of these will protest that though they hold that property should be equally distributed, they desire to bring about this distribution, not by violent revolution, but by a process of well-considered legislation; others, that though they deny that marriage is a divine institution, a sacrament, and indissoluble, yet that they abhor the beastly license which many socialists unblushingly advocate; others will affirm, that though they believe that government rests on no other basis than human consent, and look upon it simply as convenient machinery for attaining purely human and temporal ends, yet they recognize its necessity for the orderly attainment of those ends, and have not the slightest intention or desire to destroy it. Still others will protest that though they themselves do not believe in any religion, at least not in any religion that rests upon a divine basis, in any religion except what is the creation of man himself, and have no belief in a future existence, yet they are willing that others may entertain such a belief, provided they keep it to themselves and institute no propagandism of their opinions; that though they hold that man's life is comprised entirely in the term of his existence on earth, yet that his happiness does not consist in giving loose reins to his desires, but in keeping them under moderate control, in developing his intellectual faculties and æsthetic tastes as well as gratifying his sensual appetites; that thus governing, and at the same time elevating and ennobling himself, he will secure the highest enjoyment, and escape the surfeit which follows the rude gluttony of gulping down pleasure in its crude forms, and thus distilling and refining human enjoyments into their quintessence, he will quaff the pure nectar of human existence.

Many, again, who are most deeply imbued with the principles of socialism, who hold its most radical, destructive ideas, and have developed them, in their own minds, into their most "advanced" form, know perfectly well that those ideas will not bear expression in plain words; they would outrage too deeply the common sense and better instincts of mankind. With shrewd policy, therefore,

they keep in the background the more offensive features of their schemes, or, when they are constrained to refer to them, they do it in language which conceals rather than expresses the hideous reality.

It is not at all our purpose to enter upon any refutation of the philosophy of socialism. It needs none. No man of sound moral principle will look at it with any other feeling than abhorrence, and no one who exercises common sense will come to any other conclusion than that it is impracticable as regards its relation to human industry, and that even if it were practicable, it would, if carried into effect, be a more crushing tyranny than any despot, no matter how absolute his power, has ever inflicted on man. Individual property being all absorbed in the commune, every individual having to labor for, and as, the commune directed, the spring would be broken which gives steadiness of purpose and constant impulse to individual exertion, viz., the principle that every one is entitled to possess the fruits of his labor. Government, as resting on its present divine sanctions, would be destroyed; yet a government would have to be created to regulate the commune; for the commune would simply be chaos, were every individual left to his own choice as regards the occupation he selected, or the mode or time of his employment. His labor, his time, his energies, would all be the property of the commune; how he would expend them would not be for him, but for the commune, to determine. Thus personal freedom under every form would be wiped out of existence. The individual would become simply one unit of the immense communistic aggregate. His every act and volition, his whole life in fact, would have to be subject without qualification or limitation, to the regulations of the commune. His hours of work, of amusement, rest, sleep, dress, and dwelling-place, would have to be determined in like manner by its rules; for his food he would have to be dependent on the common fund. Thus he would become the veriest slave on earth, would become simply a part of a vast machine, with the motions of which he would have to move as a convict must keep step upon a tread-wheel. He would be stripped of all free volition, deprived of all power to do a free act. This is the system, reduced to its simplest elements and carried out to its practical logical consequences, which socialistic communists, in the name of human progress, would substitute for human society—the system which they are endeavoring to inaugurate as the only remedy for all the ills of humanity.

Socialistic communism is no new thing upon earth. It has never been attempted with all the features "advanced" modern socialism comprehends, that is, the abrogation of marriage and of the family relations, the denial of the existence of a divine being,

and the denial of all property to the individual; for these propositions too deeply offend the convictions even of heathens, and of men sunk to the lowest depths of barbarism, to find acceptance. But approximate actualizations of communism as regards holding land in common, creating a common fund for the support of the community, and equalizing as far as possible the pecuniary condition of men, have been tried time and again.

In the twelfth century a communistic experiment was made in China on a grand scale, under the Emperor Chen-ts-oung, who was carried away by the plausible sophistry of Wang-gang-ché, a distinguished philosopher and adviser of the Emperor. We will state Wang-gang-ché's theory in his own words. Its similarity to that of the socialistic communists of our own day is remarkable. The chief difference is, that it is, in some respects, less radical, less irreligious, and less destructive. Leaving this out of view and changing the words *State* and *Government*, which Wang-gang-ché uses, to *Commune*, we might easily imagine that we were reading a statement of one of our more moderate, less "advanced" modern socialists. Here is what Wang-gang-ché says:

"The first and most essential object of government is to love the people and procure for them the real advantages of life, which are abundance and pleasure. To accomplish this purpose it would suffice to inspire every one with the unvarying principles of rectitude; but as all might not observe them, the State should explain the manner of following these precepts, and enforce obedience by wise and inflexible laws. In order to prevent the oppression of man by man, the State should take possession of all the resources of the Empire, and become the sole master and employer. The State should take the entire management of commerce, industry, and agriculture into its own hands, with a view to succoring the working classes and preventing their being ground to the dust by the rich.

"It is evident that by these means abundance and happiness will reign throughout the land. The only people who can suffer are usurers and monopolists, who never fail to profit by famine and all public calamities, to enrich themselves and ruin the working classes. What great harm will it be to put an end at last to the exactions of these enemies of the people? Does not justice require that they should be forced to make restitution of their ill-gotten gains? The State will henceforth be the only creditor, and will never take interest. As it will watch over agriculture, and fix the current price of provisions, there will always be a supply proportionate to the harvest. In case of famine in any one spot the great agricultural tribunal of Pekin, informed by the principal tribunals of the various harvests of the Empire, will easily restore the equilibrium, by causing the superfluity of the fertile provinces to be transported into those which are a prey to want. Thus the necessaries of life will be always sold at a moderate price; there will no longer be any classes in want, and the State being the only speculator, will realize enormous profits annually to be applied to works of public utility."

In accordance with these views, tribunals were established throughout the Empire, which fixed the price of provisions and merchandise; taxes were imposed for a number of years, to be paid solely by the rich, the question as to who were to be considered rich, being decided by the tribunals. The money thus collected

was reserved in the coffers of the State to be distributed to aged paupers, to unemployed laborers, and to whomsoever the tribunals deemed needy. The State moreover was declared the proprietor of the soil, and the tribunals of each district annually assigned land to each farmer, distributing among them the seed necessary to sow it, on condition that the loan should be repaid either in grain or provisions after the harvest had been gathered in; and, in order that the land might be profitably cultivated, the officers of the tribunals determined what kind of crops should be planted.

To carry out the scheme, still other measures in perfect harmony with communistic ideas were adopted. The entire status of the people of China was changed, and if Chinese society could have been re-created and reconstructed by Wang-gang-ché's measures, there was nothing to prevent it. General dissatisfaction and general distress ensued, but Wang-gang-ché persevered. "Beginnings are always difficult," he said; "we must expect to encounter many obstacles, and must *educate* the people into the new system." Accordingly he persevered with the whole power of the Emperor at his back, plunging, according to Chinese historians, the people of China into an abyss of misery never before experienced. The system was borne with for a few years, but it became unendurable; the people rose *en masse* and drove the socialists out of the country.

The truth is, community even of land is possible only among a semi-barbarous people. As for community of *all* property, it is impossible as a social institution anywhere, and among any people. Even amongst savages, where the idea of property is weakest, the individual feels that the piece of wood he has fashioned into a war-club or a spear, the shells he has gathered and strung into a necklace or a bracelet, the fruit he has plucked from a tree, the fish he has caught from a stream, are fruits of his own labor, and as such he may possess and enjoy them. Those who care to examine the practical operation of a community of land can do so by studying the descriptions which travellers through Russia give of village communities or "mirs." They will find that whether on a large or a small scale they do not realize the Arcadia of which socialists fondly dream.

Communism hinders all real progress, renders thorough culture of the soil next thing to an impossibility, blights enterprise, discourages the application of human energy and skill, fosters indifference and laziness, while it by no means excludes individual selfishness or promotes that general, universal love and feeling of common brotherhood of which socialists prate. Greed, covetousness, envy, laziness, sloth, injustice, extortion, oppression, dissatisfaction with the yearly assignment of land to be cultivated, with the

amount of labor to be expended, with the returns to be made to the commune, are just as prevalent in these approximate communes, as anywhere else.

We have already said, yet it may be well to repeat it, that under a commune individual liberty becomes impossible. Individual rights and interests can have no existence. They are all merged, annihilated. This has been demonstrated time and again in the revolutionary movements that have been instituted to establish communistic governments. It is shown in the forms of government that exist among semi-barbarous tribes, where communism prevails only to a limited extent. There the government takes a patriarchal form. The chief of the kahn is theoretically the head of the family, practically he is a despot. The individual who presumes to exercise liberty of action does it at the risk of his life; he becomes a rebel, an outlaw, and if he cannot combine a sufficient number of others to overawe and depose his chief, his alternative is flight or death.

The Shah of Persia, the Sultan of Turkey in the palmy days of his irresponsible unlimited power, Ivan the terrible, Zenghis Khan, are types of what the government of a commune must always practically become. Marat and Robespierre are recent examples, and the diabolical wretches who in 1871 went far towards re-inaugurating the reign of terror that prevailed in Paris in 1793, are still later exemplifications.

The advocates of communistic doctrines admit this substantially. They not only deny liberty of action to the individual, but hold that there is no such thing as individual free will. Here is an exposition of their ideas on this subject:

> "Man does not form his own character; it is formed for him by the circumstances that surround him. Man is not a fit subject of praise or blame. Any general character, good or bad, may be given to the world by applying suitable means, which are to a great extent under the control of human government."

The government of the commune consequently has the right to determine those means from a regard to the general interests of the commune, and without regard to the will of the individual, who in fact, must not be allowed to exercise his will. This, then, is the grand outcome of communism. The emancipation of labor from the thraldom of capital which is their rallying cry means with them, substantially and practically, the enslavement of the laborer, the stripping him of every personal right, the transforming him into a mere fragment of the mechanism of the commune.

Here in the United States many persons flatter themselves with the idea that our republican form of government furnishes a guarrantee of safety from any general communistic explosion. It is supposed that through the extension of the right of suffrage to

every citizen, even those who are infected with socialistic ideas, will have no inclination to resort to violent revolution, in the attempt to carry their notions into practical effect; that, if the worst comes to the worst, they will simply endeavor to achieve supremacy through the ballot-box, and that if there is a contest between them and those who are opposed to their schemes, it will be only a peaceful contest at the polls.

This, however, is a most foolish mistake. Communists see as well as others, that the universal right of suffrage as exercised here, as well as elsewhere, really does not put power into the hands of a mere political majority. They see quite clearly, as clearly as others do, the fact that monetary interests enable a comparatively small minority of persons controlling vast amounts of capital to determine our elections, and virtually dictate the action of State Legislatures and Congress. If you should urge upon them that they ought to settle the question at the polls, they would reply, and their answer would be true, "We know, perfectly well, that that would be simply to surrender to the moneyed interest." They would point to the Legislatures of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, captured almost bodily by railroad officials; to the almost universal complaints of the people against the partiality and unjust discriminations in the charges of railroads, utterly disregarded; to important business interests utterly wrecked; and to just demands, supported by the plain letter of laws, standing open and unrepealed upon our statute-books, boldly set at defiance. They would cite countless instances in which the action of State Legislatures and of the Federal Congress at Washington was plainly controlled by the moneyed power of the nation.

The republican form of our government will be regarded with as little reverence by socialistic communists as they have shown to royal governments in Europe. Nor would the fact that a majority of the people cast their votes against them at the ballot-box be any reason with them for abstaining from efforts to enforce their schemes, no more so than the opposition of kings or emperors. All, whether subjects, citizens, or rulers, who will not unite with them, they regard as enemies. They employ the ballot, when there is a prospect that by means of it they may acquire ascendency; when there is not, they employ force, the sword and musket, the torch, the rope, and the axe.

Attempts are made to check the spread of this satanic movement among the workingmen, by demonstrating that there is no actual antagonism between capital and labor; that every form of industry requires their union for its successful prosecution. This is entirely true, but it is not to the point. It is easy to see that there can be no successful prosecution, even of the simplest busi-

ness, without the investing of capital, as well as the exercise of labor. The miner who engages a man to help him load a coal-car, employs capital to the extent of the wages he pays his helper. The farmer who hires a man to plough, to sow, to reap his grain, to thresh it, employs capital to that extent. There is, it is plain, no natural or actual antagonism of capital and labor.

But all this is not to the point. It is a mere evasion of the question which has become of late years, and is now, a matter of deepest practical interest to thousands and tens of thousands of those who must make their living by dint of severe labor, a matter which communists propose to settle in a way that would transform society into a chaos, a seething caldron, where every wicked passion would ferment, and their action have no limit or check but physical force.

The question is, how shall the power which great capitalists, combining and uniting for their own purposes, do unquestionably exert, and which they exert not seldom to depress the wages of workingmen without regard to the suffering that ensues, be limited and controlled? That large capitalists do this is too plain to admit of denial. In fact it is not attempted to be denied. It is admitted and justified on the ground that they have a natural right to "buy labor" as cheaply as they can. How those who control vast amounts of capital in the United States have carried out this principle of political economy, is well known to persons who are at all familiar with the operations of our great railroad and mining companies. During the time when public attention was specially directed to the subject by the general distress that prevailed amongst our mining population, and by the strikes of "trainmen" upon our railroads, the newspapers were filled with statements and arguments justifying the railroad and coal companies. Tabular accounts were published of the wages received by miners, conductors, engineers, and brakesmen, going to show that they had no real grievances to complain of, that it was but just that, in view of the general depression of business, their wages should be reduced.

But now, what are the real facts? First, take the miners. According to the published statements of wages per day, or per ton, it seemed as though their earnings, even after successive reductions had been made, ranged from $40 to $80 per month. In reality their wages per month were often not more than one-third those amounts. Frequently they were idle through stoppage of work at the mines one-half the time. Then there were deductions to be made from the accruing wages for powder, oil, repair of tools, etc., etc. Then the purchasing power of the wages they did receive, the power to obtain a livelihood from them, was diminished by their being compelled, through various arrangements made by their em-

ployers, to purchase every article they needed for sustenance or use, "from a cradle to a coffin," at particular stores, where they were charged extortionate prices.

Thus, through the mere pittances actually paid and the extortion practiced, they were practically reduced to starvation, while at the same time it was attempted to make the public believe that their distress was mainly, if not entirely, due to their extravagance and want of economy and thrift.

It is a truth which has never yet been sufficiently noticed, that the charges of prodigality and extravagance, so continually made against the resident mining population of our anthracite coal regions, are simply slanders as regards a very large proportion of that population. There are, unquestionably, and this holds rather of the floating than of the resident population, many instances of reckless dissipation and waste of means. But this charge cannot be brought truly against the resident mining population of our anthracite coal regions as a whole. Their style of living to those who are accustomed to refinement seems rude; their humble cabins lack many of the marks of thrift that characterize the dwellings of economical workingmen elsewhere. This, necessity, not choice, forces upon them. A large proportion of them are saving and economical, and tried in past years, when their labor commanded higher pay, to lay up something out of their hard-earned wages "for a rainy day." The deposits in the saving banks, established in the coal regions, and many of them broken up by the reckless management and dishonesty of their officers and directors, furnish incontestable evidence of the truth of what we here state. It is a fact, which a few of the correspondents of our leading newspapers have referred to in their letters, but which has never yet been sufficiently brought before the public, that at the very time that attempts were made to account for the general dissatisfaction of the miners with their wages, by attributing it to unreasonable expectations, and accounting for their distress by charging it to extravagance, many of them were reduced to such poverty, that not an ounce of meat passed their mouths, or those of their wives and children, for weeks at a time. There were instances, not a few here and there, but countless instances of suffering from privation akin to slow starvation, quietly, uncomplainingly, heroically endured, with Christian resignation—instances of men who, after a scanty breakfast on nothing but potatoes, went to their work with empty dinner-cans, thus concealing their want and sore distress even from their fellow-laborers, of men who toiled all day till evening without a morsel of food. Strong men became faint from want of sustenance to their physical strength, the strokes of the drill and pick were given with feebleness because hunger had weakened and

wasted their muscles. These are facts, and it would be well if they were more generally known and more seriously thought over.

The combinations of the miners to endeavor to keep up the rates of wages were denounced as criminal, whilst the combinations of the employers to put them down went uncondemned. That the miners had the right to thus combine to protect their interests, as much so as had their employers, is unquestionable. That it was expedient or advantageous for them thus to combine and strike, we do not believe. We are of the opinion that they injured, rather than benefited themselves. But that is not pertinent to the subject here under discussion. That they adopted wrong means and methods in their strikes there can be no doubt. Their preventing those of their fellow-miners from working who wished to work, was an act of oppression and tyranny; the deeds of intimidation and violence, and destruction of property that were committed, admit of no justification. Yet it may be said in the way partly of explanation and partly of palliation, that these unlawful deeds were usually committed by a few lawless persons, who should not be taken as fair types and representatives of the whole body of miners, though all were regarded as approving if not actually participating in those unquestionably wicked and criminal acts. Then, too, the miners felt that there was no legal remedy or protection for them, in the deplorable condition to which they had been reduced. They and their families were literally starving. Starvation made them desperate, and men when in despair do things they would not do at times when reason exercises its proper control.

Then, it must not be forgotten that the owners of those mines in previous years had made their millions. They had built palaces and lived as lords. They owed their fortunes and the luxury in which they revelled to the toil of the miners, and when the amounts of coal required to supply the market decreased and prices fell off, the first thought of the owners and operators of mines was to keep up their incomes by reducing the wages of those by whose toil they had previously acquired their wealth. The extravagance and unthrift of the miners were criticized; economy and self-denial were urged upon them by men who never thought of practicing the least self-denial themselves. For the miner to resort to the stimulus of a glass of whisky, to drive away his weariness and rally from the exhaustion of a day's labor, was an unpardonable sin in the eyes of men who themselves could not dine comfortably without their wine.

We are well aware that in these remarks we will be regarded by some as setting at defiance generally admitted principles of political economy. But however useful political economy may be in its own way as a science, we believe that as between men who

are rational and moral beings, there is a higher law than any deducible from political economy, a law which often runs counter to accepted rules of political economy, or at least seems to do so, and yet produces more beneficent results to men than political economy does,—even in a material point of view the law of justice and Christian charity. And even though it did not, material results, the accumulation of wealth, either by the individual or the nation at large, are, after all, not the highest purposes for which men should labor and live. We have thus adverted to the state of things which of late years has prevailed in the anthracite coal regions with no purpose of undertaking to settle the various questions between the coal miners and their employers. Our motive is entirely different.

We wished first to give as clear a view as a succinct statement would permit of the state of things actually existing there, which has produced general dissatisfaction among the miners, and which would tend powerfully to create sympathy in their minds with the socialistic communistic movement, were not other influences of a higher character constantly at work upon them. They are *not* socialists as a general thing, and that they are not is due to the living influence of the Catholic religion upon vast numbers of them.

Secondly, and as still more pertinent to our subject, we wished to give an exemplification of the power of those who own, or at least direct and control, large amounts of capital, to so employ it as will subserve their own interest, or what they conceive to be their interest, without regard to the interest, of those whom they employ, and very often, too, in such way as is cruel and unjust.

We now take up the great railroad companies of the United States in their relation to these same points, and for the same purpose, viz., to illustrate the truth, that though capital and labor are not antagonistic in themselves, yet that large capitalists may combine, and often do combine, to promote their interests, or what they regard as their interests, at the cost of unmerited suffering and privation to those whom they employ.

In the case of the railroads the plausible plea was urged in justification of their action towards their "trainmen," that their receipts were greatly diminished by the falling off of business for the last few years. As a matter of fact the receipts of the railroads have been greatly lessened; but it is also a matter of fact that their stockholders in previous years received enormous dividends. To this the railroad officials in their published statements and arguments made no reference. They took the ground, broadly and avowedly in many instances, that the *wages of their employees must be cut down* in order that *the stockholders might continue to enjoy their usual dividends.* Here the tendency of persons who direct and control im-

mense accumulations of capital, to use their enormous power simply for the promotion of their own interest, or the interest of those they represent, and without regard to the privation their action may inflict upon others, plainly comes to view. The process of curtailment should fairly and equitably have commenced "at the other end of the line." Dividends first should have been cut down, and not until after this had been done should the wages of employees have been reduced. The reverse process was adopted, and like statements to those made in regard to the earnings of miners were published respecting the wages of the "trainmen," showing what amounts conductors, engineers, brakesmen, and flagmen, respectively, might earn per month, taking their pay per day as the basis. But the fact was kept out of view that owing to loss of time before the turns of the "trainmen" came to run trains back to the stations from which they started, the wages actually received each month fell far short of the computed amounts. In not a few instances the men were in enforced idleness, waiting for trains, and without pay, but upon constant expense for boarding, from one-third to one-half the working days in each month. Additional plausibility was given to the plea that it was absolutely necessary to reduce wages on account of the stagnation of business prevailing throughout the whole country, by announcing a general reduction of all salaries, according to a fixed percentage or proportion, from that of the president down, through all grades of employees.

Let us examine this plea:

First.—There was a seeming fairness in making the reduction proportional. But on close examination this resolves itself into a show of fairness without reality. A reduction of ten or fifteen per cent. from the salaries of high officials who were receiving salaries of from six thousand to twenty-five thousand dollars per year was a change they scarcely felt. It did not, probably, require them to abstain from a single enjoyment, or deny themselves a single luxury they had previously indulged in. But to men who were earning three, four, five, or six hundred dollars yearly, it was a most serious matter, pinching them in every way, making the difference perhaps between "keeping square with the world" or "falling behindhand," and rendering it impossible for them, in many instances, even with the closest economy, to procure for their families the necessities of life. The hardship and injustice of this were increased by some of the railroad companies withholding from their employees their wages for several months after they had been earned. Thus the railroad companies used for their own benefit, during the time they deferred payment, the money of their employees, reaping an advantage equal to the interest at current rates for money on the amounts withheld, and compelling their employees

to make their purchases on credit, and at greatly higher prices than they otherwise would have had to pay.

Secondly.—Had the railroads, as we have already urged, first announced that they would "pass the dividends" they had been regularly declaring, or cut them down to a less rate, and after that reduced the wages of their employees, their action would have been fair and just. But to reduce wages while paying their usual dividends to their stockholders was not just. The law of political economy says, "Buy labor in the cheapest market, buy it as cheaply as you can." A higher law declares, "The laborer is worthy of his hire."

Let us illustrate this by an example or two:

If a rolling-mill stands idle it still requires men to guard it night and day, to look after the machinery and keep it from rust and depreciation. The men who perform these duties earn, and deserve to receive, wages as though the mill were running and making money for its proprietor; for they are laboring in the interest of the proprietor; they are preserving his property, and keeping him in position and readiness to take advantage of any improvement in the market that may occur, and reap a future profit. So with a railroad whose stockholders may be receiving less than their usual dividends, or, for the time being, no dividends at all. The trains that pass over the road, though they may not earn enough to justify dividends, are not run out of charity either for the employees or for the public; they are run in the interests of the railroad, in order that it may retain its hold upon the business of the country, may continue in position to take immediate advantage of any increase in transportation of freight and passengers that may arise, and reap a profit therefrom. Justice, therefore, requires that those employees be paid, and fairly paid; and justice requires that there should be no reduction of wages as long as profits are earned sufficient to justify dividends to stockholders. To reduce wages while declaring dividends is beginning at the wrong end. It is grinding the employees, the men who do the work from which the profits accrue, into the dust, in order to save the pockets of those for whom they are working. This, it seems to us, is the common sense, the equitable way of looking at the matter.

We know very well that this is not a popular doctrine among business men; but is it not just? It is unquestionably the way in which workingmen look at the matter. The denial of it constitutes one of their grievances, and is alleged as an instance of the manner in which those who possess or control capital practice injustice towards them. It was this more than anything else that led to the strikes, accompanied with or followed by criminal, wicked, and foolish destruction of property and life at various points on our

railroads last summer. It was criminal and wicked, for it was a violation of law, human and divine. It was foolish, stupidly foolish, because, owing to the derangement of business and the losses and destruction of property, it lessened the demand for labor, and rendered the condition of workingmen worse than it was before.

Moreover, it must be remembered that the stockholders on some of these railroads had for a series of years been regularly receiving dividends of eight, and nine, and ten per cent. per annum; and sometimes extra or special dividends additional. It should be remembered, too, that in some instances, in most instances indeed, we believe, these dividends were paid upon stock that had been largely "watered;" in other words, stock that represented no capital actually paid in. In the case of one of our most important railroads, and one of those that is regarded as having been most successfully managed, a summary of the extra dividends of stock that had been distributed to stockholders in addition to cash dividends, which generally were at the rate of ten per cent. per annum, was recently published. These extra stock dividends amounted to somewhat more than the whole capital originally paid in; or, as the compiler of the statement referred to expressed it, each holder of the original stock had received back the whole amount of capital he originally invested, besides dividends at the rate of ten per cent. both on his original stock and on an equal amount of stock subsequently awarded him.

Now take this case, it may be an extreme one, but there are many that approximate it, and apply it to the late controversies between railroad companies and their employees. On the one hand you have a corporation whose stockholders, in addition to dividends largely exceeding the legal rate of interest allowed on money, have had returned to them every dollar of the money they invested; in other words, stockholders who have no actual capital invested other than the accumulated profits awarded them. On the other, you have men laboring to preserve to the road what business there is for the time being to do, and to keep it in position to take advantage of any future increase of business. Who now should first suffer through the diminished income of the road? The principles of political economy, or at least the ordinary rules of business, say, the employees, in case the railroad companies can hire other men at the reduced wages they propose to pay; the employers have a right to buy the labor they need at the lowest possible rate. A higher law, the law of Christianity, here interposes and says, no, the employer should have equal regard for the interests of his employees as for his own. But this we now pass over. We are simply speaking of the rules which do govern men in their ordi-

nary business operations, not of those which should govern them. The laborer on the other hand claims the natural right to get as high wages as he can, in other words, to sell his labor at the highest possible price. Here then, again, the antagonism between employers and employees, between those who possess and control capital, and those who expend their labor, appears. And in the conflict which ensues the former almost invariably succeed in dictating to the latter. Combinations of workingmen against their employers enforcing their demands by strikes may, in some few instances, win the day, but the victory seldom or never brings any permanent increase of wages. We do not say that strikes, unless they are accompanied with intimidation of those who are willing to work, or with other lawless acts, are always wrong; but, at best, they are extreme measures, justifiable, like war, only when the wrong committed is utterly unendurable, and can be remedied in no other way. And, like war, they always involve waste, waste of time, which is money to the workingman, waste of his previous earnings, loss of business to the employer, waste and loss to other industrial pursuits more or less connected with that in which the strike takes place, and all this to an amount which the temporary increase of wages, that in some few instances of successful strikes have been obtained, never make up. As a general thing the employers come off victorious because capital is power, and those who possess or control it have superior power over those who possess only their labor.

The case referred to, of directors of a road reducing wages in the interest of stockholders, whose stock no longer represents any outlay or investment, suggests another fact which illustrates the immense power of those who control large amounts of capital, and of the manner in which they often use that power. It has been alleged by those who are familiar with railroad statistics, that the railroad companies of the United States have watered their stock to the extent of five hundred million dollars, in other words, that their stock represents five hundred millions of dollars more than the amounts of money actually paid for that stock. Look at the manner in which this tells upon the business interests of the country. In order that the stock thus inflated may acquire and maintain a value in the money market, it is necessary that dividends should be declared and paid upon it. To effect this the charges for freight and passenger transit must be kept at higher rates than otherwise would be necessary. Dividends of six per cent. annually are the very lowest that will accomplish the object. In fact six per cent. is insufficient. Dividends of eight or ten per cent. are required. Consequently the railroads, in order to keep their watered stock at par or above it, have had to collect annually from the

public, in the form of passenger and freight charges, from $40,000,000 to $50,000,000 more than they otherwise would have needed to collect. We do not vouch for the exact correctness of these figures. They are taken, however, from statements made by those who profess to know, and whose business it is to study railroad statistics. Their exact correctness is not necessary to the point we here make. Be the exact amount thus collected from the public larger or smaller by many millions, it is a burden to that amount imposed upon the business interests of the country. It interferes with and hinders to that extent the transit of passengers and the transportation of freight. Some years ago the Legislature of Pennsylvania imposed a tax upon the tonnage passing over certain railroads, and the Legislature of New Jersey a like tax upon passengers. The railroads immediately affected remonstrated strenuously until they procured the repeal of the laws imposing those taxes. They argued, and their argument was sound, that the sums they were compelled to pay into the State treasuries were really taxes upon the business passing over the railroads. They made the payment to the State, but they collected it from the public. On this plea they obtained the repeal of the obnoxious laws.

But now the same argument can be urged, and with far greater force, against the action of the railroad companies in "watering" their stock. In doing it they have imposed taxes upon the business interests of our country ten or twenty fold greater in annual amount than those against which they so strenuously protested.

It may be said in reply to this, that it was done under color of law, that the legislatures of the States that chartered the roads allowed them to enlarge their stock basis. But this only proves the fact we have been insisting on, viz., the power which those who control large amounts of capital exercise in shaping and directing legislation to the accomplishment of their own purposes, without regard either to the interests of the public at large, or of employees.

What makes this action of the railroads still more flagrant is the fact that railroads do not stand theoretically on the same ground with private individuals, to whose accumulations of capital and manner of investing or employing it there is no limit as long as they violate no enactment of law. Railroad companies are public corporations, supposed to be chartered for the promotion of the public benefit as well as for the personal profit of their stockholders. They possess and enjoy through their charters certain immunities, privileges, and powers, which are granted to no individual. They may take possession of land against the will of its owner, they may run their road through a gentleman's pleasure-ground or a workingman's garden, subject only to the pecuniary

damages that shall be assessed. They may cut up a farmer's fields into triangles, or separate them from his house and barn in such way that he, his family, his laborers, and cattle, must cross their tracks, at the peril of life, going to and from the farm. They virtually monopolize the transportation of the country, raise and lower freight and passenger charges at pleasure, and do a hundred things that individuals may not do.

They are allowed to do these things under the expectation that they will regard the interest of the public and promote it by their action. Do they do it? That they have increased the business of the country, developed its resources, encouraged the settlement of vast regions which otherwise would have remained without other inhabitants than our Indians, is true. But these results are incidental, they are not the primary nor the principal objects the management of our railroads have in view. If you should urge the promotion of those objects upon their directors at the expense of the business of their roads, they would tell you: "We do not run our roads on that principle. If the public is benefited, so much the better, but if not, we still must look to the interests of our stockholders." And not seldom have railroad managers carried out this principle in a manner entirely adverse to public interests, making money for their stockholders, or for those who may be in the ring along with themselves in some private speculation, by the ruin of important interests already established. The fact is too well known to allow concealment or denial, that by the arrangement of their stations, by their discriminations in charges, their rebates and deductions from general rates, allowed to some, withheld from others, old towns have been virtually ruined and new ones built up; established and important business interests have been destroyed that others might be created; old channels of trade have been closed as though a dam had been thrown across them, and the business which flowed through them forced in other directions. It is no secret that extensive regions in the States along our Atlantic seaboard have been kept virtually a wilderness, occupied by a sparse population, with industry depressed, their forests unfelled, their fields poorly cultivated, prevented from developing their natural resources, hindered from the exercise of due enterprise or energy on the part of those who live in those regions, through the enormous discriminations against them, and in favor of more distant regions. It is no secret that the coal and lumber and valuable ores of some districts are shut out from market in order that they may be brought in from other districts, less favored as regards natural advantages, but more favored by those who control our railroads. Nor is it a secret that all this is done, because those who manage our railroads manage them primarily and, we may

say, supremely for the promotion of their own purposes and objects. They possess immense power through the enormous amounts of capital which they control, and they employ that power in furthering their own interests.

In these last sentences we have anticipated the question that perhaps has arisen in the minds of our readers. "What is the point towards which your remarks are directed? What is your object?" Our object is simply to show, what when stated in plain words is an undeniable truth, but which nevertheless is constantly disputed, that those who have and control capital, especially those who control large accumulations of capital, are frequently, almost constantly, in antagonism to what are called the working classes; and also that the primary idea in their minds is the promotion of their own particular interests, and not the interests either of their employees or of the public at large. We have referred to the action of our mining and railroad corporations as furnishing the plainest proofs of these facts. But all that we have said respecting mining and railroad capitalists holds good, though not so evidently perhaps, nor to so great an extent, of every branch and form of business.

Are we endeavoring to justify the hatred of capitalists which unfortunately exists in the minds of many, or to fan it into an intenser flame? By no means. We wish simply to enforce the truth that money is power, and that like power under any other form its possession is attended with temptations to employ it for purely selfish purposes. Capitalists are no worse than other men. Many of them are noble exemplifications of benevolence, philanthropy, and widely-exercised Christian charity. Selfishness is not confined to those who are capitalists. Workingmen when they get power into their hands are as liable to abuse it as are capitalists. Their strikes have often exemplified this. They have not seldom been unreasonable in their demands, taken advantage of an employer, when with a large contract on his hands he was compelled to accede to unreasonable requirements or lose his business and all he possessed. Their preventing, when on a strike, others from working who are anxious and willing to work, and at the same time clamoring for "free labor," is both inconsistent and in the highest degree tyrannical. Their destruction of the property of employers and of others who perhaps have no connection whatever with the questions involved in the strikes, their compulsory stoppage of work, and other acts of intimidation, violence, and lawlessness, are all utterly unjustifiable.

But this again only proves more conclusively our point, which is, that power, in whatever hands it happens to be lodged, and by whomsoever it is exercised, is liable to be abused, and invariably will be abused, unless restrained and regulated by a higher author-

ity than mere natural or human considerations. Moreover, though workingmen, when they get the upperhand of capitalists, do often abuse the power they temporarily wield, the abuse lasts but a short time. In the end capital always triumphs, because it is the greater power. The abuse of power by capitalists consequently is chronic; that by workingmen is occasional and temporary.

This brings us to the concluding question of our protracted discussion: Is there no remedy for this perpetual abuse of power? no remedy for the antagonisms that exist among men, and which here in the United States, as well as in other countries, are showing themselves more plainly and more portentously every day in the existing strife between those who have money and those who have it not?

If there is not, the strife will continue, and with every day's continuance will become fiercer. The subjection of the laboring classes by the moneyed men will become more confirmed and more galling. They will be pressed down into even deeper depths than as yet they have been. A chronic condition of dependency, a serfdom, a real slavery ten times worse in its moral effects than ever negro slavery was,[1] will be their lot. For money is powerful, and nowhere more so than in the United States. This is attempted to be denied, or rather concealed, for denial of so patent a fact is preposterously silly. Capitalists in this country more than anywhere else on the earth hold the reins of power; and our supreme and all-absorbing idolatry of material prosperity strengthens their hands.

If the process going on in our midst continues, it will soon bring us to a condition of things like that of Greece and Rome in ancient heathen times, or far worse, culminating in fierce intestine social insurrections, in which the scenes of the French Revolution of '93 will be re-enacted, until society in self-defence will turn against the struggling masses, and pitilessly bring them again into

[1] To the negroes who had no desire to change their condition, as was the case with many, slavery was not a condition of unwilling bondage, and produced no discontent. But by the working classes, educated in youth in our public schools, trained to believe in the universal equality of men, and taught systematically to regard temporal goods, wealth, social position, and political office as the fruition of all human desire, the climax of human destiny poverty is regarded as a curse. This lesson is drilled into children from their first entrance into our public schools until they leave them. "Daniel Webster was the son of a poor man; Henry Clay was a poor boy; George Law, William H. Vanderbilt, John Jacob Astor, all were poor boys; it is possible for you to reach as high honors as Webster or Clay, still higher, *you may become* PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; or you may become as rich as Vanderbilt or Astor; you should all aim at this." This is the lesson taught the boy, whose lot in life, it may be, is to work in a stone quarry, or as a railroad "navvy," by teachers, directors, and distinguished visitors of public schools. With the thoughts and inordinate desires which such teaching enkindles, the poverty and dependent condition of the poor become a bondage tenfold more galling than that of a slave. Their hearts become a very hell of seething passion.

subjection. May this danger plainly impending over us be averted. That it may be, we must apply an effectual remedy to the state of things now existing in our midst.

We have seen that the schemes of socialists are impracticable, and that even if they were practicable, they could only be realized by the destruction of individual liberty, of the established institutions of government, of all that is comprehended in the term civilization, and, last and above all, of religion.

The ultimate objects which socialists desire to reach are many of them good: the limiting of human selfishness; the wresting of power from hands who misuse and abuse it; the alleviating of misery. These purposes no one can object to. The misfortune is that socialists adopt the very means which will defeat the objects they professedly have in view; their sin is that they oppose the only means by which men can be regenerated and delivered from their miseries.

So, again, human government, conducted merely with a view to temporal ends, recognizing no other basis or source of authority than the mere will of the governed, furnishes no remedy. For, whether the government acts through an absolute monarch, a king holding his crown under a constitution, or a president and congress elected by the votes of a whole people, it expresses, after all, unless it acknowledges higher sanctions than man can give it, nothing else than the wishes, and carries into effect nothing else than the purposes, of those who happen to possess and exercise the greatest amount of power in the nation, whatever be the shape that power assumes, and by whatever means it be exercised, be it in the form of an army holding down the people with bayonets and Krupp guns, or in the form of capitalists controlling legislators and executive offices, or of both combined. A republican form of government is plainly no guarantee against this; for in no form of government can legislators and executive officers be so easily manipulated by those who possess influence and power, as under a republic.

Where, then, is the remedy to be found? Or have mankind been left to a condition of constant enmity, culminating from time to time in intestine strife and fierce bloody conflicts between those whose interests, gauged only by regard for temporal ends, continually antagonize?

The remedy, if there is one, cannot possibly consist in any alterations or changes in the industrial, social, or political relations of men, leaving their natures unchanged. The cause of the trouble is not external to human nature; consequently an external remedy will be powerless. The cause and source of the trouble is in the nature of man; it is sin which produces selfishness. That is the cause of the difficulty, and to that the remedy must be applied. Is

there a remedy for this, one that can limit and restrain it, and finally expel it?

There is a remedy, though men too often forget it, and when urged upon their attention, too generally ignore it, despise it, deny it. It is the Christian religion. Not the vague, formless, unreal thing popularly called Christianity, to which men have given the name, but which is utterly destitute of the power which Christianity does possess and does exercise; not the so-called Christianity whose vaunted merit is that it is creedless, that it has no positive fixed dogmas; in other words, that it holds forth no defined truths to challenge the acceptance of men. Such a Christianity, if such were Christianity, could have no power or influence. It would itself be dependent, as is in fact the form of religion that thus boasts itself, entirely on the mere pleasure of the individual, whether he will be ruled by it or not. It is more unsubstantial than a shadow, and has no real power to restrain men from following out the selfish bent of their sinful nature to any extent. Before the fire of passion, in the heat of desire to effect a purpose, it disappears as flax in the flame.

The Christianity to which we refer is the religion which Christ established in His Church, which is carried to the ends of the earth, and perpetuated by His Church, which has the guarantee of His promise, and is the fulfilment of that promise, to be with His Church "all days unto the consummation of the world," which has creeds and dogmas embodying and proclaiming fixed, unchangeable, positive, definite truths, and which urges upon men the acceptance of those truths, and the carrying out of those truths into actual practice in their lives, under the sanctions of divine authority, and under the alternative of their salvation or damnation throughout eternity.

Is it demanded that we point out the manner in which the Christian religion provides a remedy for the antagonisms to which we have adverted, the answer is plain and simple, though to bring forward all the proofs and illustrations of its effectual power that might be adduced, would require volumes.

1. Christianity in the Church takes hold of the poor. To them the Gospel is especially preached. It limits and regulates their desire for temporal comfort. It teaches them resignation, submission to Providence, not as a vague powerless sentiment, but as a positive duty. It keeps constantly in their minds the thought that Providence determines their lot on earth, and that though it be an humble and a hard one, under a temporal point of view, yet it is ordered in divine wisdom, and if they accept it in the spirit of filial faith and submission, it will prove to have been ordered in infinite mercy. Christianity diverts their attention from their weary

life in this world, its privations, its suffering; teaches them that if they offer up those privations, that suffering in union with the sacrifice upon the cross, they will be recompensed a hundred fold hereafter; that life on earth is short, but the future life is eternal; that existence here has higher objects than what one shall eat and wear; that its real end is to prepare us for enjoying the Beatific Vision in the kingdom of heaven; that hatred, envy, jealousy, are mortal sins; that we must love even those who are severe and unjust to us; that vengeance belongs not to us but to God. The Church ever holds up the truth that those who accept poverty and bear it in the right spirit, from love for God, will be blessed more abundantly than all others; that our divine Lord, though possessor of the glories of heaven, and Creator and Ruler of the Universe, yet for our sakes became poor, was found in the form of a servant and had nowhere to lay His head.

These truths the Church enforces by precept and example. They are not empty words with her; and the poor know and feel it. She exemplifies her teachings in the daily life of her Religious, and of saintly men and women, who in every country on earth, strip themselves of worldly honors, of high station in society, of wealth and all its temporal advantages, and adopt instead a life of self-abnegation, of utter poverty, humility, constant labor.

Thus these truths are brought home to the poor, not in the manner in which persons outside the Church sentimentalize and philosophize about them, but in their living reality and power; and thus the fire of wicked passions which toil, suffering, and privation engender is quenched, useless longings and ambitious desires for a condition beyond reach are repressed, and vain strugglings after what cannot be attained are suppressed.[1] Contentment and cheerfulness, acquiescence in what is recognized as providential circumstances drive out discontent, jealousy, hatred, and the other wicked passions to which discontent and inordinate ambition give rise.

2. The Church lays hold of the wealthy in like manner. It enforces upon them the truth that power under every form is accompanied with temptations to misuse and abuse it. That this is the case with riches; so peculiarly the case that our divine Lord expressly declared that it was difficult for the rich to enter the kingdom of heaven; that while the acquiring and possession of money is not wrong, yet the "*love*" of it is "*the root of all evil;*"

[1] Secular rulers understand this, though they seldom acknowledge it. On one occasion, soon after Napoleon Bonaparte was declared Emperor, a number of French savans were discussing in his presence the best means for repressing the growing discontent of the populace, and the best means for preventing the spirit of insurrection and revolution from spreading. After listening for some time in silence to their various ideas and propositions, he said, "Gentlemen, all you have said is very fine, but I will tell you what is more effectual." "What is that, Sire?" they inquired. "A Sister of Charity," answered Napoleon.

that the wealth of the rich is not their own, but is given to them in trust, and in order that they may employ it as stewards employ the possessions of their master.

These lessons, too, the Church enforces, not with words destitute of significance, but accompanied with countless examples. She holds up before the wealthy the roll of canonized saints, of those who are honored by the Church in heaven and on earth as the most faithful followers of Christ and the greatest benefactors of men, because they stripped themselves of wealth, and when rich became poor; because they loved the poor, denied themselves for the poor, toiled for the poor, devoted their whole lives to the poor. Thus the Church continually teaches the wealthy to "consider the poor," to employ the power which wealth gives, not to grind them down into deeper poverty, but to be just and generous and charitable to them; to regard them not with contempt or indifference, but to look to their interests, to sympathize with them, help them, love them.

3. The Church, where allowed to exert her proper influence, in like manner takes hold of government. She teaches rulers that the power lodged in their hands is from above, and is not to be exercised arbitrarily, or in the spirit of partiality, for the elevation of some and the depression of others, but for all without respect of persons; that though the object of government is immediately for the protection of men in their temporal pursuits, yet that mediately and ultimately it is for the advancement of the glory of God, through the elevation and moral and religious improvement of men. The Church reminds rulers that human society and all its institutions rest upon divine principles and sanctions, which dare not be disregarded; and that in the observance of them is to be found the only safeguard of society, the only surety for its peaceful existence, for the stability of government, and for its fulfilling its proper purpose.

The questions may be asked, Why the Church has not done all this? If the Church has this power, how comes it that universal concord and peace do not reign among men? that injustice and oppression have any existence? The answer is plain and simple. It is because men oppose, hate, and resist the Church: because men pervert relations designed to help and elevate them into means for depraving themselves, for promoting selfishness, abusing power, engendering wicked passions; because they pervert government, which has been clothed with authority in order that it might suppress evil and be a protection and defence to the Church, into a most potent engine of resistance to her action. Men are free agents, and as God will not, cannot, against their own free-will, lift them out of the "bondage of corruption," the sinfulness of their own

nature, which is the source and cause of all their misery, neither can the Church, unless they co-operate with her by consenting to the truth, and corresponding with the grace which she continually holds out to them.

Wherever the Church's influence reaches, and to the full extent to which men allow that influence to operate upon them, she does the beneficent work which we have cursorily described. Look at what she achieved during the Middle Ages, the manner in which she broke down barriers that divided mankind, and instituted cordial relations between those whose hands had been at each other's throats. Peoples who were fierce savages were transformed into civilized nations, their rude and cruel customs one after another abolished; the bondman, the badge of whose condition was an iron ring around his neck, whom his master might slay at will as he would a dog, emancipated and elevated to the condition of a free man and to the relation of a Christian brother; the harshness and severity of feudalism, that system of "blood and iron," first ameliorated and then utterly abolished; the fetters of the captive broken off, and the chains of the slave gradually worn away by the gentle attrition of charity, until they dropped off unknown almost by himself and his master. The wealthy and the powerful, the noble and the king, were made to feel that Christ was the LORD of lords and the KING of kings; that the highest object to which their power and their wealth could be and should be devoted, was the greater glory of God through the amelioration of society, the suppression of wickedness, the relief of the suffering. The poor were made to feel that poverty and a lowly condition of life were not absolute evils, that they might readily be turned to such good account that they would become blessings; that they should not envy the rich, nor hate those of higher station than themselves, nor resist those who exercised lawful authority, but love them, honor them, obey them.

What the Church has done for society, for men of all ranks and conditions of life in past time, she may and can do now if men will allow her free course of action. She will do it, provided men in the exercise of that free-will with which God has endowed them, do not wickedly oppose her. She *is* doing it, and to an extent that many even of her friends do not perceive nor understand, while her enemies deny it. When the latter do acknowledge it, they acknowledge it with a view to misrepresenting it, and that they may turn it into a justification of their hatred and opposition.

BOOK NOTICES.

DE GRATIA CHRISTI. Prælectiones Scholastico-Dogmaticæ quas in Collegio, SS. Cordis Jesu ad Woodstock maxima studiorum Domo Soc. Jesu in Fœd. Americæ Sept. Statibus habebat A.D. 1877–'78, *Camillus Mazzella, S. J.*, in eodem Collegio Studiorum Præfectus et Theol. Dogmat. Professor. Woodstock, Marylandiæ: Ex Officina Typographica Collegii. 1878. Large 8vo., pp. 811.

Here is another learned, ponderous tome from the pen of Father Mazzella, of Woodstock, which will go far to convince the world that the mysteries of Theology may be expounded as copiously and as learnedly in the New World, and in our day of universal superficialness, as they used to be three centuries ago in Rome or Salamanca. This one treatise on a single subject almost equals in bulk the entire course of theology taught in some seminaries. As to the skill and ability with which he has handled his theme, they are fully commensurate with the author's reputation, and those other fruits of his studies in divinity with which he has already enriched the theological world.

The book treats of Grace, God's best gift to man, and which, nevertheless, owing to man's pride and wickedness, has from the earliest times furnished a fine field for the rioting of private judgment and the coining of some of the worst and most deadly heresies that have afflicted the Church and destroyed the souls of her rebellious children.

In his first chapter, or "Disputation," Father M. points out the various meanings and divisions of the word *grace*, and establishes the perfect freedom of the human soul, even when moved by and acting under the impulse of divine grace. "Freewill and grace (to use his own words) combine to form one adequate, proximate, effective principle of the *actus salutaris*, or meritorious work." He then treats of the necessity of grace, a necessity denied by Pelagians and semi-Pelagians, and practically forgotten or thrust out of sight by nearly the entire non-Catholic world of to-day, which is fast unlearning all that is supernatural in Christianity. Yet the author does not fail to assign the proper limits to this necessity, which has been unduly exaggerated by some theologians, whose zeal (not true but fancied) for God's grace has led them very close to the condemned errors of Bajus, Jansenius, and others, who teach that unbelievers and sinners can do nothing good, but sin in all their actions.

From the necessity of grace the author passes to the consideration of its efficacy, and shows that what is called *gratia efficax*, or grace that accomplishes its intent by securing the co-operation of the will, does not differ in reality (*entitative*), but only extrinsically from *gratia sufficiens*, or grace which, owing to man's perverseness, fails to secure the will's co-operation. This principle, once established, leads naturally to the rejection of those systems invented to explain the mysterious co-working of God's grace and man's freewill, but in which the integrity of the latter seems to be violated by an "irresistible (*victrix*) delectation," or a "physical premotion or predetermination" on the part of grace. These systems have been fathered on St. Augustine and St. Thomas, but unjustly; and they can scarcely be reconciled with well known sentiments and passages of these holy doctors. They purport to be rational explanations of what is confessedly a serious difficulty, but they are themselves harder of comprehension than the problem they were invented to solve. They are mysteries that make as large a demand on our faith as any of those taught in Scripture and defined by Pope or

council, but with this great difference: the latter are vouched for with certainty by divine revelation. But who are Dominick Bannez and Gregory of Rimini, holy and learned men as they were, that we should accept at their hands new mysteries for which they can plead no revelation? Father Mazzella refutes these hypotheses soundly and thoroughly, but with great moderation, and does not (as theologians sometimes do in the heat of controversy) qualify them as redolent of Jansenism and Calvinism. This is forbidden by the Holy See, which tolerates the teaching of these systems, and will allow any one to defend or refute them as he pleases, provided he do not put them on a par with defined doctrine, or lower them to the level of heresy or other teaching proscribed by the Church.

The system of Molina which Father Mazzella defends (and from which, he well remarks, that of Suarez differs only in name) is really and truly a rational attempt to solve the arduous problem, and reconcile the conquering energy of divine grace with the inviolate freedom of man's will. It is based on God's attributes, not on His omnipotence alone (the Jansenist Quesnel thought he said something very complimentary to God's grace when he defined it as only another name for His almighty power), but chiefly on His infinite knowledge and that mercy that is beyond all His works. God has a knowledge not only of what does and does not happen, but also of what may or may not happen in a condition of things that is not actual, but only possible. For the benefit of the non-theological reader this knowledge on the part of God may be best explained by an example. Suppose a man living in sin, who has neglected his soul and avoided the sacraments for many years. His family and friends pray for him, but their prayers seem never to have reached the ear of divine mercy. He hears every Sunday the admonitions and warnings of his pastor, but they make on him no impression. He is ever the same obdurate, impenitent sinner. But God has not been deaf to the importunities of His servants; He was only awaiting His own good time. Out of the depths of His infinite knowledge He foresees that if this hardened sinner enter a certain church on a certain day, and listen to a certain preacher, he will hear a text of Scripture, a Gospel maxim, pressed home to him with such overwhelming force of conviction, that it will crush and subdue his impenitent soul. God foresees also, perhaps, that unless he go to that church and sermon the unhappy man may visit some friends, amongst whom he will be entangled in new sins; or he may meet there some eloquent emissary of Satan, who will persuade him to join a secret society, which will be for him the first but infallible step to final reprobation. Or it may be in reserve for him that, returning by night, he shall stumble and fall, and be brought home insensible to die in his unrepented sins. God, in His infinite mercy, moved by the tears and prayers of those who have interested themselves on behalf of that unfortunate soul, inspires him with an aversion to going elsewhere, or puts persuasive energy into the mouths of those who ask him to go with them and hear the sermon. He goes; he hears something that he has heard unmoved a thousand times before; but the way in which it is said, the winning earnestness and energy of the preacher, invest the familiar truth with a new and overpowering light of evidence. His rebellious soul is conquered, its gate opens to admit the grace that knocked there so long in vain, and from his pew he makes his way to the confessional, where he bewails and renounces his sinful life, and becomes once more a child of God and heir to the Kingdom. That God possesses this knowledge of futuribles, as the uncouth but accurate language of the schools terms them, that is of things possible, whether

they happen or not, is instinctively believed by all Christians, even the humblest and most ignorant, and it requires all the presumption of a theologian to deny it, as some have had the hardihood to do. But the Scripture is too plain to be gainsaid. When our blessed Saviour (Matt. xi., 21) was reproving the obduracy of the inhabitants of Corozain and Bethsaida, after having been favored with the sight of his miracles, He assured them that had the same wonders been done in Tyre and Sidon, the inhabitants of those two cities would have been converted, and would have done penance in sackcloth and ashes. The repentance of the Tyrians and Sidonians never happened. It was contingent on the sight of miracles which it was not given them to see. Yet this repentance which never came out of the world of possibilities into the world of being, was as truly an object of divine knowledge as the sparrow that falls to the ground, or the empire that is overthrown for the sins of its rulers.

In the next chapter, which treats of the economy of grace, the author explains the meaning of that celebrated axiom: Facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam. "To him who does what he can, God will not refuse His grace." To each and every man, even the unbeliever to whom the Gospel has never been preached, God grants means of salvation, not because anything they do can deserve His grace, but insomuch as they do not place obstacles in its way.

The next chapters, with which the author concludes his work, are on Sanctifying Grace and on Merit. Not only the dogmatical side is treated against the heresies of the last three centuries, but also sundry scholastic questions connected with these points are discussed; for example, whether sanctifying grace be a gift "physice permanens," and really distinct from the soul and its powers; whether it be really or only virtually distinguished from the "habitus charitatis," how far the just man can merit *de condigno*, how far *de congruo*, etc. These and the like questions, though never pronounced on by the voice of authority, have in addition to their novelty (for most of our clergy) the recommendation that they generally tend to bring out the dogma in all its fulness, and thereby render it much more intelligible than would the bare controversial proof against heretics that it has been revealed in God's written or unwritten Word.

And this furnishes an answer likewise to those who may think our author has taken too much time and space to prove what those outside of the Church have ceased to impugn, at least with the dialectic weapons of their fathers. The Catholic dogma of grace, with its interwoven doctrines of freewill, merit, etc., whether misunderstood, perverted, denied, or simply ignored as it now is by heretics and unbelievers, who look on it as a remnant of exploded superstition, remains for us what it has been from the beginning, a portion of the consoling revelation that God has vouchsafed us. Its intrinsic value never changes. Its hidden mysteries will form the contemplation and delight of the blessed in heaven throughout all eternity. Why should it not claim the attention, the study, and investigation of the theologian on earth.

Father Mazzella has supplemented the volume with an analytical index of over thirty pages, which is in itself a valuable compendium of the whole treatise.

LIFE OF BLESSED REGINALD OF ST. GILES, O. P. Translated by a Dominican Nun. with an Introduction by *Very Rev. J. A. Rotchford, O. P.*, Provincial of St. Joseph's Dominican Province in the United States. 12mo., pp. 142. Westchester, N. Y.: Printed at the Boys' Protectory. 1877.

This is a brief but well-written biography of one of the early shining lights of the Dominican Order, a friend of its holy founder, and one who greatly helped in its first propagation. Indirectly, the book throws much light on the state of the Christian world, especially in Southern Europe, in the thirteenth century and the years that preceded it. It helps the reader to learn how much needed was the appearance on earth of those two great preachers of Gospel truth, Francis of Assisi, in Italy, and Dominic of Callahourra (*la fortunata Callaroga*, as the great poet calls it), in Spain. They were reproductions, at God's hands, of pre-Adamite creation, the one flaming with "seraphic ardor," the other "resplendent with cherubic light," as the same half-inspired bard designates them. They were raised up as God's instruments to fulfil the unfailing, everlasting promises He had made on behalf of His Church, to aid (we cannot help borrowing the expressions of the old Ghibelline poet) in guiding Peter's bark on her appointed way, to save Christianity from something far worse than the barbaric scourge with which Goth and Vandal had once visited her children. Of St. Dominic in particular it may be said that his special mission was to restore practically the purity and integrity of the Catholic faith, of which Dante represents him as wholly and solely enamoured, styling him

> . . . . . L'amoroso drudo
> De la Fede Cristiana.

As if he would say, no earthly knight could ever devote himself to the wooing and winning of his earthly mistress with half the fervor that Dominic showed in serving the Christian faith, the Royal Bride that had come down from heaven, for whom he would secure, if possible, the homage of every heart, the service of every sword throughout the world.

Father Rotchford introduces the translation to the American public by a spirited, eloquent preface, in which he briefly sketches the history and principle of monasticism. Its forms are many, but its principle is one, and that principle is to be found in the maxims of Christ's gospel. Hence the history of monasticism is necessarily coextensive with that of the Christian Church. Father Rotchford praises highly his own Order, but this is natural. His praise, however, is based on truth, nor does it make him unjust or blind to the merits of the other Orders. Yet, perhaps, he is going too far when he takes away (p. 24) the credit of the hymn "Dies Iræ" from Thomas of Celano, and confidently gives it to the Dominican Cardinal, Latino Malebranca. We add an extract or two from Father R.'s introduction that will specially interest the American reader.

"The freedom with which Christ has made us free, finds its personification in the child of St. Dominic. Educated deeply in the sublime school of the Angelic Doctor, nurtured by contemplation under a government essentially republican, untrammelled by aggrandizement or hope of preferment, he breathes the atmosphere of liberty with keen desire, and is strengthened to assert even by his blood the grand truths of religion. Witness, for instance, Peter of Verona; at the supreme moment of his free soul just escaping from its martyred tenement of clay, he wrote with his finger on the sand, in his own blood, the victorious '*Credo*.' Witness the same spirit which relieved Martin de Porres of the chains of slavery, clothed him in the garb of the friar, and subse-

quently exalted him even to the honors of beatification. Witness the same intrepidity which actuated Louis Cancer, the beloved apostle of the Indians of South America, who, sighing for new kingdoms to conquer, entered into Florida with the gospel, only to become the protomartyr of that land of flowers.

"The Dominican in those days was almost ubiquitous. Whilst Brother Gaspard of the Cross was the first missionary to penetrate the exclusive 'walls' of China, at the same time in the antipodes his brother Dominican was making the first exploration of the head waters of the Potomac. At this time, while Chili possessed forty houses and convents, the Dominicans were evangelizing the eastern coast of Africa, had established a house in Japan, and were singing divine psalmody amidst the perpetual snows of Greenland. Incredible as it may seem, this inhospitable land had welcomed the sons of St. Dominic more than a hundred years before Columbus was born. Their convent was described by Captain Nicholas Zahn, A.D. 1380; and there they still remained praying, preaching, and studying until discovered by a party of Dutch sailors early in the seventeenth century."

As regards the translation we are glad that it is in our power to praise it. The English is good and free from those Gallicisms which so often spoil the translation of Catholic works from French into English. We must, however, make a passing remark on one anomaly. Jordan of Saxony, so famous in the early annals of the Dominican Order, is always under the pen of the translator "Jourdain de Saxe." If this were proper, then his friend and companion, "Henry of Cologne," should have been translated "Henri de Cologne," which would be simply no translation at all. Proper names should be Englished as far as possible, or suffered to wear their native garb, not given to their reader under their French form, when that form is not original. Hence we must object to Marbourg (for Marburg), Lutece (for Lutetia or Paris), though we should have had no objection to retaining "St. Germain des Prés," which the translator thought proper to render "St. Germain of the Meadows." This may seem trifling, but propriety is based on general rules even in small matters, and will admit nothing that is capricious or arbitrary; and there is no reason under the sun, why Catholic translators should not observe these rules. We are infinitely beyond the non-Catholic world in our knowledge, not only of heaven's revealed doctrine, but even of earthly philosophy. One of our children who knows his catechism could teach them more than they have learned, or ever can learn, of the moral and social problems of this world. Why should we condescend to remain behind them even in literary taste, for which, after all, they are solely indebted to the Catholic Church?

THE CHURCH AND THE GENTILE WORLD AT THE FIRST PROMULGATION OF THE GOSPEL. Considerations on the Catholicity of the Church soon after her Birth. By *Rev. Augustine J. Thebaud, S. J.* 2 vols., royal 8vo. New York: Peter F. Collier, Publisher. 1878.

The motto of the Psalmist, "Domini est terra et plenitudo ejus," prefixed to his book by Father Thebaud, gives a clew to the purpose which our learned and amiable author had in view when compiling this admirable treatise, which he modestly calls "Considerations on the Catholicity of the Church soon after her Birth." God never made this world for the sake of man's material interests. Its elements were not given him that he might find in them ever new helps for his bodily ease and comfort, and for the avoidance of pain and labor. Its seas were not designed to be the mere highways of his commerce, nor its plains to be

the fields where he might reap glory by the slaughter and subjugation of his fellow-men. The earth, with "all the fulness thereof," was to be the temporary inheritance and dwelling-place of a "kingly and priestly race," as St. Peter styles regenerated mankind. It was meant to be that "city of God" of which St. Augustine has traced the history in that marvellous book, which bears on every page resplendent proof that the Church had a true philosophy of history centuries before the Voltaires, Humes, Gibbons, Milmans, and other such pigmies were heard of among the children of men. If by her side there arose a city of Babylon that disputed her sway, it was not her fault nor that of her Divine Founder. But in His wisdom He used the very wiles and struggles, the hostile assaults and seeming victories of that city of Babel to develop the resources and spread abroad the energies of the city of God, and thus prepare the way for the appearance of His Church, which was to hold the same relation to the old city as the fulness of revelation, when God became manifest in the flesh, bore to the imperfect glimpses of heavenly truth vouchsafed to the patriarchs and prophets of the old covenant.

The universal expansion of the Church, which was consequent upon the labors and preaching of the Apostles, was only the visible development of her inborn Catholicity. It was her entering into possession of that sway over the nations and the "ends of the earth" which had been promised her by the Psalmist as her birthright. And our author spares no pains to prove that to enter into her inheritance she had at every step to do battle and conquer every inch of her triumphant way. It was no effete, superannuated idolatry, ready to perish of internal decay (as some modern Christians with Pagan proclivities and sympathies are constantly telling us), that she had to meet and overthrow in Europe, Asia, and Africa, the civilized and the barbarous world. It was an idolatry full of strength and vigor, interwoven with the social and political life of those peoples. And nothing short of a miracle can account for its destruction.

To illustrate this point, and prove how far above human power or human means was the wonderful victory of the Church, Father Thebaud goes into detail, and shows what a powerful obstacle to conversion, besides idolatry, was to be found in the absence of ethnological homogeneousness in those countries where the Apostles and their disciples preached and toiled. A superficial view of this matter—and such is the view most frequently taken—would lead us to imagine that the Apostles of early Christianity had but three hostile elements to encounter and subdue: the Roman, the Hellenic, and what may be called the Barbaric. But on closer examination, as Father Thebaud conclusively shows, each of these elements resolves itself into such heterogeneous masses that the difficulty of reaching and subduing them becomes appalling to contemplate. And if this was true even of Italy, how much more (as the author well remarks) of Gaul, this side of the Alps, and beyond them, and of the mixed races of Spain, Northern Africa, Britain, etc.?

The Apostles, as St. Paul tells us, considered themselves debtors to all men, wise and unwise, Latin and Scythian, Greek and Barbarian. But though ethnographical considerations never entered their minds any more than distinction of social classes, rich or poor, bondmen or free, learned or illiterate, yet we must not overlook the immense obstacle placed in their way by the morally and socially divergent aspects of those varied tribes and nationalities though when living under one government. Indeed, the conversion of one tribe, section, or national family, or what would lead to it, might perhaps prove a serious difficulty, a downright hindrance, in the way of converting another. This point is well brought out by Father Thebaud, and admirably confirms his position as to the

miraculous rapidity of the world's conversion from the very beginning of the Apostles' preaching and missionary labors.

We regret that our space does not allow us to give some extracts from this book, remarkable not only for its erudition, but for its lively and entertaining style, nor to do more than call attention to a few points in a work teeming from beginning to end with sound theology and ripe scholarship. We would particularly direct attention to what the author says of early Christianity in Persia, Armenia, India, and Arabia, and in which will be found a good deal of matter not only interesting but new to most readers; also to his remarks on the early Pontiffs, and his exposure of Milman's theory of Latin Christianity. But *manum de tabula*. For if we entered into a detail of the many excellencies of Father Thebaud's book, we should end by holding up for special commendation each and every one of its chapters.

KÉRAMOS AND OTHER POEMS. By *Henry Wadsworth Longfellow*. Boston: Houghton, Osgood & Co. 1878.

This volume contains the poems written by Longfellow since the year 1875. They are marked by the charm of sentiment and diction for which the author is famous. It is to be regretted, however, that he did not select a subject more worthy of his powers than that of the origin and the progress of the ceramic art. We may remark, by the way, that there is no orthographical authority for *keramic*, a spelling which, to say the least, is affected. The departure of late in this matter is confined to the spelling of proper names derived from the Greek, but the best usage is in favor of rendering the Greek κ by the familiar *c*. It is of the highest importance to such an arbitrary language as the English, to preserve uniformity in spelling and pronunciation. No improvement or accuracy is imparted by spelling Socrates, *Sokrates*, or Æschylus, *Æskulos*. A display of cheap learning is detestable.

We have intimated that the subject of *Kéramos* is beneath Longfellow's powers. In *Wapentake* he invites Tennyson to join with him in a crusade against "the howling dervishes of song," but assuredly *Kéramos* is anything but a trumpet-call to a noble contest for the elevation of poetry. It was to be hoped that Longfellow's profound appreciation of Dante would have led him to compose a glorious song of Christian faith and hope, but he relinquishes such an ideal to sing the praises of pottery.

He visits in the poem the famed centres and factories of ceramics

> "That . . . fill the air
> With smoke uprising gyre on gyre,
> And painted by the lurid glare
> Of jets and flashes of red fire."

The best descriptions are those of Delft, Holland,

> "What land is this that seems to be
> A mingling of the land and sea?"

and of the artist, Pallissey, whose enthusiasm and patient toil under manifold drawbacks and difficulties afford the poet a fine opportunity for his favorite moralizing.

At intervals is introduced the *Potter's Song*, whose musical rhythm keeps time to the turning of his wheel. The best stanza alludes beautifully to a text of St. Paul:

"Turn, turn, my wheel. This earthen jar
A touch can make, a touch can mar.
And shall it to the Potter say,
'What makest thou? Thou hast no hand?'
As men who think to understand
A world by their Creator planned
Who wiser is than they."

There is, on the whole, a sense of incompleteness about the poem, and a vagueness in the descriptions, particularly of China and Japan, that do not stand out with that vividness which the poet usually imparts; but these may be considered difficulties inherent in the subject which he has unfortunately undertaken.

The most spirited of the sixteen poems fancifully entitled *Birds of Flight*, is *The Revenge of Rain in the Face*, which treats of the death of General Custer. The poet asks:

"Whose was the right and the wrong,
Sing it, O funeral song,
With a voice that is full of tears,
And say that our broken faith
Wrought all the ruin and scathe
In the year of a hundred years."

This poem should have been dedicated to our Indian Commissions, if it were possible to move them by any gentler means than a tomahawk.

The rendition of the sonnets of Michael Angelo reveals that great genius as a genuine poet. The book is very handsomely printed and bound.

Ethics, or Moral Philosophy. By *Rev. Walter H. Hill, S. J.*, Professor of Philosophy in the St. Louis University, Mo., author of *Logic and General Principles of Metaphysics*, pp. 342. Baltimore: Murphy & Co., 1878.

We have here a book which has long been needed, not only as a text-book for colleges and academies, but also as a work for the general reader and especially for professional men. As a text-book it is sufficiently full to be of real use to the student, and yet not too extensive for one year's study. It does not exhaust the subject of ethics, it does not even touch upon all the various questions which belong to the science of morals; but no one of the leading theses has been omitted, and the principles stated and proved in this little volume, if pushed to their conclusion and applied with discretion to cases that may arise, will help to a wise solution and be a sufficiently safe guide in life.

It will be noticed in more places than one, that the author is not friendly to some of the popular and prevailing notions of modern times, on liberty, law, government, authority, the relation of civil to ecclesiastical polity, etc. But he has always given a reason for his reprobation of these notions; and the sad condition to which modern ideas have, at last, reduced the States ruled by them, might of itself be proof enough of their fallacy and of the folly committed by those who have adopted them in practice.

Ethics furnishes the first clew to reach the true cause, and to detect it at its sad work, and this is much. It requires more than ethics to restore health to society; but society will have itself alone to blame if it does not apply the remedy which is pointed out to it.

We must learn to call things by their real name, and cease to make license of liberty, depravity of education, impudence of independence, revolution of legitimate government, anarchy of social life, murder and robbery of true liberty, communistic riots of reform in the relations of

labor and capital, public peculation and shameless fraud of legislation, might of right, darkness of light, and fatal error of heaven's highest best gift, truth.

A careful perusal and attentive study of this book, in which we find the sound ethics of the grand old scholastic doctors reproduced and applied to our times, will engraft such principles upon the minds of our people, of the men who are to make our laws and shape the destinies of our country, as will save them from fatal errors, and secure our liberties against the evils which are now rapidly undermining them.

Hence we say that no book should receive a more hearty welcome than this treatise on moral philosophy from every true lover of his country. And though, perhaps, many are too far astray in the devious paths of modern anti-social systems to be brought back by anything that we can say or do, let us strive to save our youth, at least, from imbibing those false and pernicious principles; and, therefore, let this book be placed in the hands of all the pupils in our colleges and academies, whose proficiency renders them capable of understanding and appreciating its teaching.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ARITHMETIC, AS DEVELOPED FROM THE THREE FUNDAMENTAL PROCESSES OF SYNTHESIS, ANALYSIS, AND COMPARISON. Containing also a History of Arithmetic. By *Edward Brooks, Ph. D.*, Principal of Pennsylvania State Normal School, and author of a "Normal Series of Mathematics.

This is quite an elaborate work, and will be of great value to school teachers and others who, though familiar with the usual rules and methods of computation, are yet unacquainted with the principles on which those rules and methods depend. Arithmetic in most of our schools is taught chiefly for the sake of its practical uses. Professor Brooks's work aims at exhibiting it in the character of a science, and will, we hope, tend to promote a higher appreciation of it in that respect.

The historical portion of the book contains a large amount of interesting information in regard to the various methods of arithmetical notation, numeration and computation, employed in early times, and traces the gradual improvement in those methods producing greater facility in calculations up to the present time.

The strictly arithmetical portion of the work is valuable; but unfortunately Prof. Brooks has gone beyond his subject, and unnecessarily gives expression to certain metaphysical and historical notions, not strictly necessary to the discussion of the topics which he is treating, and which are open to wide controversy as regards their correctness. It was not needed to elucidate his historical sketch of the progress of arithmetic by a sneer at "ecclesiastical ignorance and superstition" in the age of Sylvester II. Prof. Brooks's lugging in metaphysical discussions are equally unnecessary and equally unfortunate.

He evidently is not strong in metaphysics, and should have eschewed them on that account as well as because his metaphysical episodes divert attention from the subject he professedly treats. A single example will suffice to show this. In a long and altogether needless discussion about "time," he says: "Time is one of the two great infinitudes of nature. Space and time are the conditions of all existence. Time is a grand intuition. . . . . Time is infinite. It is in its very nature . . . . without beginning and without end. We conceive all particular times to be parts of a single endless Time. This continually flowing and endless time is what offers itself to us when we contemplate any series of occurrences. . . . . Time is considered as having but one dimension. . . . .

Time exists as a series of instants, which are before and after one another."

There is evident confusion and self-contradiction in these statements. Of the philosophical and theological errors they involve it is unnecessary to speak. Like comments might be made on some other discussions which Prof. Brooks indulges in, altogether unnecessarily, in regard to the origin of our ideas, of number, space, etc.

Prof. Brooks's proper theme is the properties and relations of numbers. When he treats of them he is entirely at home. The defects, consequently, which we have pointed out, though they certainly are serious, and awaken distrust which is only dispelled by subsequent perusal, yet do not affect the value of the book as a treatise on the principles upon which arithmetical rules and processes depend. We regard it, therefore, as an important contribution to our existing mathematical literature.

THE LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER, Apostle of the Indies and Japan, from the Italian of D. Bartoli and J. P. Maffei. With a Preface by the *Very Rev. Dr. Faber.* Eighth American from the last London edition. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 8vo., pp. 653.

This is a most interesting and well-written life of a great saint, whose spiritual conquests rival those of the Apostles, and by whose side the Alexanders, Napoleons, and other sons of Anak, on whom this world so prides itself, dwindle into insignificance. St. Francis was a model of what in worldly speech is called enthusiasm, but in the language of the Church is known as zeal. He might well have said with the Psalmist: *Zelus domus tuæ comedit me,* "I am eaten up and wholly consumed by the zeal of Thy house." It was the mainspring of all his actions and the secret of his success. What our saint did for the Indies and Japan has yet to be done for America. Here, too, we are surrounded on every side by idolatry, false gods, base superstitions, darkness, and ignorance, all the more dangerous because puffed up with self-conceit and boasting of enlightenment. And it is to be feared that it will go harder with some of us on the last day than with those poor pagans who remained deaf to the words of St. Francis.

Who is to convert these worse than pagan masses all around us? It is unquestionably the mission of the Church; but each and every one of us should co-operate with the Church, and be a Xavier in his own little sphere. We cannot all preach from the pulpit, but we can all, if we will, preach by our deeds. We can show forth in our lives, and thus compel all men to see, whether they will or not, the holiness of the Church and her teaching. And this preaching by example is often more effectual than preaching by words. The humblest and most ignorant of the early Christians were co-workers with the Apostles in spreading the Gospel and saving souls. By their lives, silently but powerfully, they supplemented the written or spoken word of the anointed heralds of salvation. The very slaves who became Christians, as St. John Chrysostom tells us, by their virtues subdued the hearts of their haughty masters, and brought them on bended knee to sue for the regenerating waters of baptism. This is our mission likewise; for we are like the household of Tobias, the children of the saints dwelling amongst the unregenerate of Babylon, *in medio nationis pravæ et perversæ* (Phil. ii., 15), among whom the Apostle warns us that we must shine like bright and guiding lights. What transformed Xavier from the gay and somewhat vain student into the saint and Apostle? It was the Gospel maxim *Quid prodest:* "What does it avail a man were he to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" He had often heard the words before;

but one day they fell upon his soul with the light of a new revelation, and he forthwith became a saint, bent on saving his own soul and the souls, if possible, of all men. And we too, if we come happily to learn the value of our own souls, shall soon learn to value and help other souls to salvation.

FREDERICK OZANAM, PROFESSOR AT THE SORBONNE. HIS LIFE AND WORKS. By *Kathleen O'Meara*. Catholic Publication Society Co. 1878.

Though Frederick Ozanam held in France during his life, and since his death has continued to hold, a high rank as a *savant*, an orator, and as a great Christian teacher in the Sorbonne, yet until recently his name was not widely known in this country, indeed was almost unknown among non-Catholics. Yet he was one of the most learned of Frenchmen, and one who occupied a most distinguished place in the group of courageous Christian men who fought bravely and to some extent successfully, for the moral and religious regeneration of France. He lived in an unbelieving age and nation. What temptations must have surrounded and assailed him, and what firmness and constancy of faith it must have required to withstand those temptations, can be easily imagined.

The work before us shows how Frederick Ozanam resisted these temptations, and, while yet a student and a mere youth, entered heroically upon a war against the infidelity and impiety then prevalent all through France, and especially in Paris. It sketches curtly but graphically the state of religion subsequent to the Revolution; the reign of atheism; the attitude of Napoleon towards the Church; his policy towards the clergy; his conduct in relation to Pius VII.; the fall of Napoleon and the restoration of the Bourbons; the revival of Voltairianism; and the manner in which Ozanam, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and a band of other Christian co-laborers, few in numbers, but strong in faith, zeal, and devotion, combined with great natural abilities and learning, courageously rolled back the flood of impiety which had deluged France. It depicts his brilliant career as a Professor of the Sorbonne; his labors as a journalist; his love for the poor; his conception and establishment of the Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul; the difficulties encountered and overcome; his eloquence, his research and study in preparing for his *History of Christian Civilization among the Germans* and for his *Civilization of the Fifth Century;* his other literary and religious labors; his ill health; his last days, and edifying death. The subjects treated of are of the highest interest, and the accomplished author of the book has displayed good judgment and great ability in her treatment of them.

STUDIES IN SPECTRUM ANALYSIS. By *J. Norman Lockyer, F. R. S.*, Correspondent of the Institute of France, etc. 12mo., pp. 251. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

How true the adage, "Ex assuetis non fit passio," with respect to the wonders which physical science has accomplished in our age. Many such wonders are in our midst, from the steam-engine, photography, the telegraph, down to the recent telephone and phonograph, and yet they fail to excite any great emotions of wonder, because we have become familiarized with them. We have come to regard them as matters of course. Not the least among them, certainly, is the science on which this book treats.

Mr. Lockyer is a high authority on this subject, and in the present work he has made a valuable contribution to its literature. It gives in a direct and simple style the results of the author's studies and

researches, and informs the reader of the latest developments in this progressive department of science, and we have no doubt but that it will be hailed with welcome by the scientific. After an introductory chapter, containing some clear and forcible explanations of the undulatory theory of light, the author has a chapter on "Methods of Demonstration and Laboratory Work." The subjects of the remaining chapters are, "On Spectrum Photography," "Atoms and Molecules Spectroscopically Considered," "Long and Short Lines," "On the Spectra of Salts," "On Dissociation," "An Attempt at Quantitative Spectrum Analysis," "On the Coincidences of Spectral Lines," "The Elements Present in the Sun."

The book is illustrated by eight plates and a large number of wood-cuts.

HANDBOOK OF INSTRUCTIONS AND DEVOTIONS FOR THE CHILDREN OF MARY. Translated from the second French edition by *Rev. J. P. O'Connell, D.D.* 12mo., pp. 277. New York: Catholic Publication Society Company. 1878.

A good little book, and we must add well translated, a praise that cannot conscientiously be given to those Catholic books without number which are daily "done out of French" into English or some semblance of it. No doubt they are profitable to publishers and promote devotion. But piety in good English would be no less acceptable to Almighty God and His heavenly court, and might yield equal profit to our publishers. The author gives good advice and instruction, and, occasion offering, talks plainly but with perfect propriety as a Christian teacher should on some subjects which are too often ignored in pious books, as if they were beyond the comprehension or unsuited to the actual needs of our young women. Never was there a greater mistake. Owing to the diseased state of our present civilization, which the sons of men call progress, but which is a stench in the nostrils of all right-minded men and women who have been brought up as Christians, our girls of fifteen know more than their grandmothers. They talk to each other of matters which would arch with horror the brows, and redden with shame the cheeks of those aged matrons. The wicked world knows this perfectly well and feigns ignorance; but that is no reason why we should humor its detestable hypocrisy and allow false prudery to supply the place of true modesty amongst our Christian youth of either sex. The book has the *imprimatur* of the Cardinal Archbishop of New York and of Bishop Loughlin of Brooklyn.

THE SPEAKING TELEPHONE, TALKING PHONOGRAPH, AND OTHER NOVELTIES. By *George B. Prescott.* Fully illustrated. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1878.

The inventions of the telephone and of the phonograph are so recent and so wonderful, that the general idea we believe entertained respecting them is that they are due to a happy thought instantaneously conceived, combined with equally happy and exceptional success in immediately devising the methods necessary to applying the thought to practical uses. The work before us dispels this illusion. It gives a history of the experiments and studies industriously engaged in by different investigators, who step by step pursued the path which each new discovery made more plain, until at last they arrived at the point they have reached. Franklin, Galvani, Lesage, Coxe, Oersted, Arago, Davy, Ampere, Sturgeon, Barlow, Henry, Faraday, Gause and Weber, Sir William Thompson, Steinheil, Cooke, Morse, Page, Rice, Stearns, Edison, Gray, Bell, and Dolbear all have had some part, either by their scientific

discoveries or by their ingenuity and mechanical skill, in inventing methods and mechanisms by which these discoveries might be applied to practical purposes in the production of the telephone and phonograph.

The work before us gives a history of these successive discoveries, with scientific accuracy and minute detail. It recounts the experiments that were made, the machines that were invented, accompanying its accounts of the latter with numerous cuts and illustrations.

THE LOVE OF JESUS TO PENITENTS. By *Henry Edward Manning, Cardinal (and) Archbishop (of Westminster)*. New York: Catholic Publication Society. 1878.

Whenever Cardinal Manning takes up his pen, he is sure to enchain the attention of his readers not only amongst Catholics, but perhaps even more so amongst those of the great non-Catholic, English-speaking world. He is admirable when, in a learned treatise, with remorseless logic, he tears to pieces and scatters to the winds the vain figments of Anglicanism or of modern science falsely so called, or when he glorifies the prerogatives of Peter's See and refutes the windy paragraphs of Gladstone and his German sources of inspiration. But to our mind he is yet more admirable in this charming little book, in which he unfolds from a moral and theological point of view the sweetness and consolations of the Sacrament of Penance.

HISTORY OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS FROM ITS FOUNDATION TO THE PRESENT TIME. In two volumes. Translated from the French of *J. M. S. Daurignac*, by *James Clements*, author of the "Life of Sir Robert Peel." Second revised edition, with an Appendix from 1862 to 1877. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1878.

An accurate and trustworthy history of the famous Order, so persistently misunderstood, so cruelly persecuted, so bitterly maligned, from the day of its first institution by St. Ignatius down to our own days. It is not so voluminous as the work of M. Cretineau Joly, but is better suited to the general reader, for it makes use of all the documents collected by that historian, and is free from some of the rhetorical defects that mar the otherwise commendable work of that lively French writer.

DEVOTIONS FOR THE MONTH OF MAY, adapted from the Italian of Don Vincenzo Pallotti. By a *Priest of the Archdiocese of St. Louis*. 18mo., pp. 172. St. Louis: P. Fox. 1878.

This book was written in Italian by that venerable servant of God, F. Vincent Pallotti. His style is well known to us, as we had the privilege for years of hearing him in his instructions and in the confessional. We fear it has been translated too loosely, and that the attempt to make good English out of the book has only served to dissipate whatever there was of charming and edifying in the plain language of the original. The English language, unlike the French, does not tolerate addresses to the Deity, the Blessed Virgin, or the Saints in the second person plural. They are to be addressed with Thou, Thee, Thine, etc. The translator has endeavored to do this, but in his anxiety to preserve the second person singular he has made a fearful misuse of it, which sadly disfigures the book.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE POISON FOUNTAIN: OR ANTI-PARENTAL EDUCATION. Essays and discussions on the school question from a parental and non-sectarian standpoint. Wherein the decline of parental authority, the downfall of family government, and the terrible growth of crime, pauperism, insanity, and suicides, in America, are traced directly and unmistakably to our anti-parental public school system. By *Zach. Montgomery*, of the California Bar. 8vo., pp. 189. San Francisco: Published by the Author. 1878.

A COMPENDIUM OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF ANCIENT HISTORY. With an Appendix containing a Dissertation, by E. Von Lasaulx, on the study of the classics, translated from the German. By the *Rev. Henry Formby*, Author of "Monotheism the Primitive Religion of Rome," "Sacrum Septenarium," etc. *Interroga majores tuos et dicent tibi* (Deut. xxxii., 7). *Teste David cum Sybilla* (Sequence of the Rom. Miss.). 8vo., pp. 174. London: Burns and Oates. New York: Cath. Publ. Society. 1878.

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. The history, trials, and triumphs of the work of God at Lourdes. By the *Rev. Hilay Maurice Vigo*, Pastor of St. Joseph's, Turin, and formerly Professor in the Seminary. Translated from the Italian under the supervision of the Franciscan Fathers, and published by them at Trenton, New Jersey. 1878.

LES ETATS UNIS CONTEMPORAINS: OU LES MOEURS, LES INSTITUTIONS ET LES IDEES DEPUIS LA GUERRE DE LA SECESSION. Par *Claudio Jannet*. Ouvrage précédé d'une Lettre de M. Le Play. Troisième edition, revue et augmentée de chapitres et documents nouveaux. Two vols. Paris: E. Plon et Cie. 1877.

A SHORT AND COMPREHENSIVE COURSE OF GEOMETRY AND TRIGONOMETRY. Designed for general use in schools and colleges. By *Andrew H. Baker, A.M., Ph. D.* New York: P. O'Shea, Publisher. 1878.

UBALDO AND IRENE: A historical romance from the Italian of Father Antonio Breschiani, S. J. By *Anna T. Sadlier*. In two volumes. New York: D. and J. Sadlier & Co. 1878.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES. By the *Graduating Class of St. Joseph's Academy*, Flushing, L. I. Translated from the French of Mme. Foa. New York: P. O. Shea. 1877.

THE YOUNG CONVERTS: OR MEMOIRS OF THE THREE SISTERS, DEBORAH, HELEN, AND ANNA BARLOW. Compiled by *Mrs. Julia C. Smalley*. St. Louis: P. Fox. 1878.

OFF ON A COMET! A journey through planetary space. From the French of Jules Verne. By *Edward Roth*. With thirty-six full-page original illustrations. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. 1878.

ELEMENTS OF PHILOSOPHY, COMPRISING LOGIC AND ONTOLOGY: OR GENERAL METAPHYSICS. By *Rev. Walter H. Hill, S. J.* Professor of Philosophy in the St. Louis University. Fourth Revised Edition. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1878.

ALVIRA, THE HEROINE OF VESUVIUS. A remarkable sensation of the seventeenth century. Founded on facts recorded in the Acts of Canonization of St. Francis of Jerome. By *Rev. A. J. O. Reilly, D.D.* New York: Sadlier & Co., 1877.

THE LITTLE PEARLS: OR GEMS OF VIRTUE. Translated by *Mrs. Kate E. Hughes*, New York: P. O. Shea. 1877.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF ATHEISM. By *John Stuart Blackie*. 8vo., pp. 253. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1878.

KNOWN TOO LATE. By the Author of "Tyborne," "Irish Homes and Irish Hearts," etc. Baltimore: Kelly, Piet & Co. 1877.

A VISIT TO BOIS D'HAINE, THE HOME OF LOUISE LATEAU. By *Francis R. Home*. Baltimore: Kelly, Piet & Co. 1878.

A CATECHISM OF THE HISTORY OF IRELAND, ANCIENT, MEDIÆVAL, AND MODERN. By the *Rev. James J. Brennan*. New York: Thomas Kelly, Publisher. 1878.

LES SOCIETÉS SECRÈTES. Par *Claudio Jannet*. Troisième edition. 12mo., pp. 128. Paris: Librairie de la Societé Bibliographique. 1877.